THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

July, 1920 Vol. 7 No. 5

Editorial Comment - - - - 387
Signs of Catholic Life.—Radicalism.—The Science of Raising Money.—The Young Person's View of the Church.—Dr. Parks on Diocesan Conventions.

The Unpopularity of the Church - - 397
Hamilton Schuyler

Spiritism as a Religion - - - 412
Frank Gavin

The Social Message of the Church - - 425
Floyd S. Leach

Our Lesser Ladies of July - - - 438
Minna Caroline Smith

Partyism and the Church—Part II - - 441
William M. Gamble

Some Aspects of Reservation - - - 448
Edwin D. Weed

Book Reviews - - - - - 462

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under Act of March 3, 1879

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 42 Albany Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
OFFICES: 42 ALBANY STREET, NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

"I very cheerfully enclose $2.00 for the nenewal of my subscription. I was one of the first subscribers and I have enjoyed the AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY every month since." (Signed) CAPTAIN D. R. FAY, Dallas, Texas.

The American Church Monthly

Fourth Year

A magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing with questions confronting the Anglican Communion and more especially the Church in the United States. Subscription, $2.00 a year. 20c a copy.

SELDEN PEABODY DELANY, D.D., Editor.

From the Bishop of Pennsylvania: "I am very glad to express my approval of the American Church Monthly and my conviction that it will occupy an important place in our church life."

The American Church Monthly is reaching a large and growing audience of readers, worthy of the traditons of our Communion, and drawing to its staff of contributors a continuous exhibit of latent scholarship which has long waited an outlet for its encouragement.

RENEWALS NOW DUE.

Bills are now out to all whose subscriptions are expiring.

PLEASE REMIT PROMPTLY.

The circulation of the "American Church Monthly" has been maintained and somewhat increased from the time of its first publication. We believe that, as a magazine, it has been constantly improving and fills a distinct position in the literature of the Church, which was needed, and that it is worthy of a much wider circulation. Although the cost of publication has been increased, and we have no desire or intention of so increasing it because we desire its wide circulation among the Clergy and thoughtful laymen. The circulation ought to be trebled, and if this could be done, it would put the magazine beyond any thought of ever increasing the price.

We are asking our friends to procure additional subscriptions. If you appreciate the magazine, as we think you do, you will be glad to make the effort. In addition to this, the publisher would be very glad to receive a list of names from you which might be canvassed.

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Manager

11 WEST 45th STREET - - - NEW YORK

ADD THE

Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice

TO YOUR LIBRARY

The following list shows how varied is the ground covered by them:

SECOND SERIES

The Eucharistic Sacrifice, By Rev. Darwell Stone, D.D. (Ready in August). 1.80.

Broad Church Theology: Its Limitations and Defects. By Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. 1.35.

FIRST SERIES

Each volume 1.15.

Reunion. By Rev. S. L. Ollard.

The Missionary Question. A general Survey. By the Rev. M. R. Newbolt.

The Virgin Birth of Our Lord. By the Rev. Leonard Prestige.

The Episcopate and the Reformation. By the Rev. Professor J. P. Whitney, B.D.

The Place of the Laity in the Church. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, G. Bayfield Roberts, Gordon Crosse, N. P. Williams.

The Place of Women in the Church. A series of papers as follows: The Teaching of St. Paul as to the Position of Women, Rev. Canon Goudge; Ministrations of Women in Church, Rev. Dr. Darwell Stone; The Ministry of Women and the Tradition of the Church, Rev. Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson; The Claim of the Priesthood for Women, Lady Henry Somerset; The Ordination of Women, Geraldine E. Hodgson; The Medical Ministry of Women, Mary Scharlieb, M.D.; The Religious Life for Women, Mrs. Romanes; Younger Women and the Church, Miss E. K. Sanders.

Catholic or Roman Catholic. By the Rev. T. J. Hardy, M.A.

Conscience of Sin: Six Lenten Sermons. By the Rev. T. A. Lacey, M.A.

Defects in English Religion. By the Rev. J. N. Figgis, D.D.

Recent French Tendencies. By the Rev. G. C. Rawlinson, M.A.

The Prayer of Consecration. By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D.

The Reserved Sacrament. By the Rev. Darwell Stone, D.D.

The Sacrament of Penance. By the Rev. H. U. Whelpton, M.A.

Morehouse Publishing Co.

1801-1811 Fond du Lac Avenue
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

CONTRIBUTORS FOR JULY

The Rev. Hamilton Schuyler is Rector of Trinity Church, Trenton, New Jersey.

The Rev. Frank Gavin, S.S.J.E., is in charge of the Preparatory Department at Nashotah, Wisconsin.

The Rev. Floyd S. Leach, Ph.D., is Curate at St. Thomas' Church, New York.

Miss Minna Caroline Smith is a Churchwoman living in New York City who frequently writes for magazines.

The Rev. William M. Gamble is Rector of St. Paul's Church, Manheim, Pennsylvania.

The Rev. Edwin D. Weed is a Priest of the Diocese of Duluth.

The American Church Monthly

A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing with questions confronting the Anglican Communion and more especially the Church in the United States

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

42 Albany St., New Brunswick, N. J.

President: George A. Armour, Princeton, N. J.
Vice-President: Guy Van Amringe, 55 Liberty Street, New York
Secretary: The Rev. Charles C. Edmunds, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York
Treasurer: Haley Fiske, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Two Dollars a Year — Twenty Cents a Copy
Canadian subscription, $2.25 a Year — Foreign subscription, $2.50 a Year

Volume VII — July, 1920 — Number 5

Signs of Catholic Life

IT is sometimes asserted, by writers like Dean Inge, that the Anglo-Catholic Revival which was initiated by the Oxford Movement has spent its force, and is no longer an influence worth considering. It has unquestionably in some places gone to seed, but the question is whether the seed will not some day spring forth into a rich harvest of Catholic lives. In other places however the Revival still shows abundant signs of life and energy. In any case there are many who contend that its work is by no means completed. It will not be completed until the Lord's service is everywhere restored to its rightful place of honor as the chief

service of the Lord's day, until all seven sacraments of our Catholic heritage are esteemed and reverently used by all of our clergy and people, until it has become regular rather than exceptional for penitent sinners to make their confessions, until the worship of the sanctuary has been made beautiful and glorious as in the days of old, and until the religious life for men and women has become so well established among us that large companies of religious may be sent forth by our ecclesiastical authorities for the conversion of the heathen.

The Anglo-Catholic Revival is either of God or of men. If its driving power is God the Holy Ghost, then nothing that men may do can overthrow it or bring it to an end. If it is a movement instigated by human pride and kept alive by the father of lies, then it cannot last long, and the sooner it comes to nought the better. The advice of Gamaliel is by no means out of date. Those in authority in the Church should ponder it well: "Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." Those who are fighting on behalf of the Catholic cause should also bear these words in mind as a remedy against discouragement. It is not our cause that we are fighting for; it is God's cause. God can use even failures, and desertions, and stupid blunders, and weak foolish sinners, to make His name glorious and the place of His habitation beautiful once more.

Prayers and intercessions are ceaselessly going up before God that this branch of His Church may once more bring forth the fruits of Catholic faith and life for the healing of the nations. We sometimes like to stop and contem-

plate what will be the ultimate effect of all these prayers. Early on a week-day morning in a dimly lighted church our imagination sometimes pictures the thousands of altars in Anglican churches throughout the world, upon which the ancient sacrifice is being pleaded for the restoration of all our Catholic privileges. We recall the fact that at the moment those who are opposed to all Catholic tendencies in the Church are probably reposing in their beds. Can it be that it will make no difference in the end whether we are joining in the great intercession before the throne of God, or lying comfortably in bed?

Is it too much to say that as a result of these prayers of devout Catholics ascending before God in ever-increasing volume, new signs of Catholic life are springing forth everywhere, even in the most unexpected places? Here for example is a priest in a parish with broad church traditions who is taking steps to make the worship in his church more dignified and beautiful by the use of the traditional ornaments. Here is a layman in an evangelical parish beginning to enquire about confession, later buying books to read about it, and finally travelling a hundred miles to find a priest who will hear his confession. Here is a faithful woman belonging to a parish in the South, in which the Holy Communion is administered once a month only, writing to see if it would be possible for her to enter the religious life. How are we to account for these continual outcroppings of Catholic life in the Anglican communion? In spite of the valiant efforts of the sixteenth century reformers to extinguish every trace of the Catholic life of the Church in England, that life is still in her. It is now manifesting itself more and more abundantly in response to the prayers of the faithful.

Radicalism

IN the general alignment of religious forces in the modern world, Catholics form the conservative group, as being most interested in the preservation of the older Christian ideals and in contending for the faith once delivered. Protestants of various kinds constitute the liberal group, as they are more interested in progressively adapting the Christian religion to the changing needs of each generation.

In the Anglican communion however circumstances are such that Catholics, being opposed to the established order of things, are on the opposite side of the house. Thus it comes about that the central, conservative group is composed of old-fashioned high churchmen and moderate churchmen, who together constitute the majority. They are flanked on the one side by the broad churchmen who are the liberal group, and on the other side by the Catholics who are the radicals.

We confess that our sympathies are with the radicals. We are radically opposed to the deadly dull, safe, respectable kind of religion that is to be found in most Episcopal churches. We often feel tempted to put bombs under them and startle them into some semblance of spiritual activity. We fear we should be unable to keep awake under the ministrations of the conservative type of churchmanship prevailing in the average Protestant Episcopal parish. As for the liberals, they impress us as being too much attuned to the smug, comfortable, financially reputable religion of the man of the world. We are radical, because we believe in a supernatural religion, and could never be satisfied with the merely natural religion of the man in the club. We believe in the presence of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, in the power of the priest to absolve sinners, in the grace of or-

ders, in the religious life, in the Church as the mystical Body of Christ. All this is anathema to the average Episcopal vestryman. He would eagerly avoid those who believe in such things as being a group of irresponsible radicals.

Furthermore we are radical because we believe in progress and development. We believe that the Holy Spirit is in the Church to guide her into all truth. We refuse to draw an arbitrary line either at the second century or the sixth or the sixteenth, and say that beyond this line there could be no further development in practice, or no deeper apprehension of the meaning of the revealed truth of God. All that concerns us is that the development should be a legitimate development, the making explicit what had all along been there implicitly; and not a change into a different kind of doctrine. At the Council of Chalcedon, Mary was called the mother of God, though she was not so regarded at the first. That was a legitimate development. To say that our Lord was not born of a virgin is not a legitimate development of the doctrine of the virgin birth; it is a change of doctrine.

The Science of Raising Money

THE Interchurch World Movement Campaign for raising $335,000,000 in a week or ten days has failed. It seems incredible that experienced, hard-headed business men could have seriously planned to raise that huge sum in so short a time. And they have already squandered $7,500,000 on the campaign! An expert in such matters would have undertaken to raise the proposed sum at a cost of $1,500,000. A feeble-minded person might have under-

taken to see the task through for $3,000,000. But how any man or group of men could be found foolish enough to fritter away $7,500,000 in the expenses of such a campaign is a psychopathic problem too intricate for us to solve.

Money-raising is a science with well-established principles and canons that have been tried and demonstrated on a wide scale during the past forty years. Yet ecclesiastical organizations are continually flying in the face of Providence by undertaking to raise money in some other way. They proceed on the assumption that it can be raised by prayer, or by an avalanche of impassioned oratory, or by firm determination coupled with trust in God, or by a whirlwind intensive campaign, or by a series of chain letters, or by miles of pennies. Sooner or later they find that they were mistaken.

We are simple-minded enough to believe that if a campaign does not attain the end it set out to attain, it has failed. It is childish for those in charge of the campaign to say afterwards that they were not really after money, and that in any case the campaign has had a wonderful effect in arousing the Church to a new consciousness of its divine mission, and so forth. What would we have thought of the campaign to raise $5,000,000 for the Church Pension Fund, if it had finally raised only $2,500,000, and then Bishop Lawrence had told the General Convention that the campaign had really been a success, for it had brought the people of the Church to a deeper realization of the need of higher salaries for the clergy?

The Church Pension Fund's campaign is the one instance known to us of an ecclesiastical money-raising campaign that was conducted with a scrupulous adherence to all the canons of the science of money-raising. Its mechanics of

organization, its methods of publicity, its scientific calculation of the sum needed for the expenses of the campaign and of the number of months over which it must extend, were without a flaw. It was estimated in advance that $125,000 would cover all the costs of the campaign, and that fourteen months would be required to raise the whole five millions. This $125,000 was in hand before the campaign began. The actual result was that it cost $115,000, and took fourteen months, to raise $8,500,000!

This ought to be an object lesson to all ecclesiastical organizations never to undertake any kind of a campaign for raising money except in accordance with approved scientific principles.

The Young Person's View of the Church

WHY the Church has lost her hold upon young people in England is entertainingly discussed in an article on "The Church and the Young Person," by an anonymous young woman in the *Guardian* of April 23, 1920. She feels that the Church of England as a whole is utterly uninspiring to the young, and is totally devoid of all romance. She says that many young people are conscious that Rome exerts upon them a powerful attraction, but that intellectual honesty would prevent their accepting some of her dogmas. What they crave is "atmosphere," which Rome unmistakably possesses, and intellectual honesty and freedom as well.

Speaking for the young people of her acquaintance, she insists that they can hope for nothing from the Evangelicals. Evangelicals are repulsive to them on account of their emotionalism, their long "hearty" services, and their

sour-faced Puritanism. Likewise, strange to say, the Broad Churchmen and the Modernists fail to make any considerable appeal. They appear to be juggling with facts and not to be intellectually honest. In particular the Bishop of Hereford made young people stagger when he declared that he could repeat the Apostles' Creed *ex animo*. The writer of the article goes on to say:

> "We should feel much happier if we could, with all our hearts believe the whole of the Catholic Creeds, but we can sometimes neither affirm nor deny. We believe whole-heartedly in Our Lord's Divinity, and feel that His is an adorable Personality. But there the Broad Church parson fails us. He appears to have no enthusiasm for a Person; law, not love, seems to be his motive-power. The system of exalted ethics preached to us by the Dean of St. Paul's, though intellectually we worship at his shrine, leaves us spiritually cold. And so we turn rather wistfully to the Catholic party. Their churches appeal to us enormously; we love their warm silence, the atmosphere which moves the soul to prayer. The solemn Eucharist touches that part of us which worships beauty; we love the devotions at the Tabernacle. On the whole, too, we find the High Church clergy congenial. They play games, they have a sense of humor, they hate dignitaries, they laud the days of 'Merrie England.' In the Catholic pulpit we do not hear the doctrines which are our particular stumbling-blocks so much pressed home; it is Sacraments on which most stress is laid. We can all see the point of Confirmation, Confession and Communion, even if our orthodoxy is questionable."

We should like to publish an article from some young person in this country, setting forth the impressions made upon young Americans by the religious forces in the United States. We have a suspicion that conditions here are not far removed from those in England, except that here we have nothing like an established church. From a rather wide acquaintance with young people of intelligence and education we would hazard the opinion that the kind of

church that most deeply appeals to them is the one that combines an atmosphere of mysticism and devotion with the intellectual attractiveness that comes from strong preaching and dogmatic teaching. That combination at any rate will draw men in large numbers, and we believe the more intelligent class of women also.

Dr. Parks on Diocesan Conventions

IN the somewhat tense debate on the Ascension Forum which enlivened the sessions of the New York Diocesan Convention, Dr. Leighton Parks made a brief and pungent address in which he confessed that he had been a sinner in condemning the Forum that has been held in the Church of the Ascension Sunday evenings, before he had sufficient knowledge of the facts. He then pleaded for the right of each parish priest to venture upon experiments which might lie somewhat outside the beaten track of the Church's prescribed order. He maintained that the Bishop alone possessed the right to check such experiments or to forbid them altogether, if he thought they were endangering the best interests of the Church at large. The diocesan convention had not the right to interfere in such matters, because, in the words of Dr. Parks, "this is not a Congregational Church, but an Episcopal Church." He said that if the convention were to dictate to him what he should do in his parish, he would not obey.

We were delighted to hear such good Catholic doctrine from the lips of Dr. Parks. We believe that it cannot be emphasized too often in these days that the seat of authority in the Church is in the episcopate. The Catholic

Church is not a soviet republic. It is the manifestation in the earthly sphere of the kingdom of God. All authority in heaven and on earth was given by God to His incarnate Son Jesus Christ, the head of the Church. He bestowed that authority upon His apostles, and they in turn conferred it upon their successors the bishops of the Church.

It would simplify the proceedings and shorten the length of diocesan conventions if they did not arrogate to themselves all the powers of the episcopate, the United States Congress and the Supreme Court. They really have quite enough business to attend to as it is.

The Unpopularity of the Church

Rev. Hamilton Schuyler

THE thesis of this article proceeds upon the assumption that the world is reverting to paganism, not the paganism of the Roman Empire of the first five centuries of our era with its gross licentiousness, its heartless cruelty, its contempt for the masses, but rather a paganism refined, educated, cultured, supersensitive to human pain and earnestly solicitous for the intellectual and material well-being of the individual. In our modern paganism the arts and sciences are held in high esteem; indeed they and they alone are depended upon to redeem humanity from grossness and ignorance and elevate it to a high pitch of civilization and material prosperity. The essence of paganism stripped of the adventitious circumstances which characterize it in any given age is the denial of spiritual considerations as compelling motives for human action and the substitution in their place of purely utilitarian principles. Paganism implies the tacit repudiation of any ideals except those which are concerned with the course of human life upon this planet. It regards man as a creature whose existence is confined to a period coterminous with his physical life and neither believes in nor regards any other alternative. The philosophy of paganism is of the earth earthy. In its modern form it indeed deprecates unsocial actions or anything which tends to imperil the integrity of the state, but it is totally unaware of sin as an offense against a divine and eternally righteous Being to Whom man is ultimately responsible for his actions. In its full development

Paganism finds no place for religion, at least for any religion which it cannot control, and decries any appeal to a higher law than inheres in its own utilitarian ideals. It boasts of enlightenment and progress, but it means by these education along purely secular lines and an advance to an ever greater degree of material comfort and well-being. Its motto is, "Man doth live by bread alone," meaning thereby all that is included in the sum of human activities directed towards the attainment of an ordered and prosperous social life.

Now religion, the Christian religion, is naturally the deadly foe of Paganism. It can make no terms with it, or so far as it does it compromises its true position. A virile Christianity is bound to come into conflict with paganism at a thousand points. Christianity repudiates a secularized education, and the doctrine of the infallibility of the majority as expressed through the ballot box and embodied in laws which infringe the moral and spiritual standards which it advocates and lives by.

That society is pagan today in Europe and America or rapidly becoming so seems to admit of small dispute. In politics, in business, in social life, the evidence accumulates that the vast majority of people are actuated by opportune and materialistic aims. The Church, meaning thereby in a broad sense, organized Christian groups and societies which represent and embody an ideal based upon a supernatural revelation, however differently interpreted as to details, is plainly shrinking in numbers and diminishing in public influence. An obvious sign of this is the lessening attendance at the public services which it maintains for worship and preaching, particularly the marked decrease in the number of children committed to its care for religious

instruction. The public school system is frankly secular and the people insist that it shall be so. Perhaps under the circumstances it can hardly be otherwise but the fact remains that millions of children are today growing up without imbibing any spiritual ideals.

It is estimated that only forty million of the one hundred and ten million of people in this country have any definite religious affiliations and of these it is probable that less than half pay much attention to their religious duties by way of money contributions or regular attendance. In institutions of higher learning, colleges and universities, most of which were founded under religious auspices and have continued under such influences up to a recent period, the materialistic spirit is equally apparent. The need for endowments and the desire for pensions for the professors have led them to divest themselves of their religious character and frankly to adopt a secular status. This of course has reacted upon the faculty and students and tended to make religion appear a negligible thing in their eyes.

Another sign of the decadence of Christianity's influence is seen in its impotence in the matter of preventing the great war or in crystalizing a sentiment for making a just and lasting peace. The diplomats, statesmen and politicians who determined the course of events cynically ignored all ideal considerations and treated the protests and warnings of Christian ethics and experience with ill-disguised contempt. In all countries the government used the full force of its authority to stifle whatever individual protests there were based upon the principles of Christianity, penalized all adverse criticism of its policies and demanded that its measures should be endorsed as the acme of righteousness and wisdom. The churches were used to dis-

seminate the government's propaganda, true or false, and to advertise the sale of its securities and other undertakings. Priests and prophets were directed to bless whom the state blessed and to curse whom the state cursed and for the most part they responded with meekness and alacrity. To make their adherents one hundred percent partisan and not rather one hundred percent Christian was assumed to be the Church's proper business. The Erastianism and timidity of the Church in the crisis brought about by the war constitutes amazing evidence of its lack of moral fibre and its loss of prestige as an independent spiritual institution concerned alone with promoting righteousness. The Church is reaping what it has sown. It cannot successfully conciliate the world and be faithful to its avowed principles. One hears on all sides lamentations as to the waning of the Church's influence and the insignificant part it is permitted to play in the serious affairs of the world. The indictment is drawn not primarily by those outside the fold but more particularly by those within. The severest critics of the Church are its own adherents. If a clear exposition of the Church's impotency is desired it is not necessary to go to its avowed enemies but to listen to what its candid friends have to say. Its own faithful clergy and laity are its accusers. It is true that they find the seat of the trouble not in any defect in the Church itself, certainly not in its faith or doctrines, but rather in the lack of moral courage on the part of its leaders as shown by their pandering to the secular spirit and their willingness to compromise its just claims in return for the toleration which it enjoys. This candor in confessing the true grounds of the Church's weakness clearly indicates the desire for amendment and points the way for its accomplishment. The first thing re-

quired is to make a true diagnosis. Then and then only can the proper remedy be applied. The world lightly esteems the Church because of its subservience to worldly influences, whereas it knows all the time that the proper function of the Church is to be the world's opponent and mentor. "The Lord hath sworn that He will have war with Amalek from generation to generation," Amalek representing the pagan spirit.

In its long history the Christian Church has experienced both the animosity and the patronage of the world and has invariably found that the former rather than the latter furnished the conditions most favorable for its spiritual growth and prosperity. The Church was a paramount moral force in the world only so long as it did not scruple to oppose the state and declared that it must obey God rather than man. It conquered the pagan empire of Rome by presenting a *Non possumus* to its demands and elected to suffer rather than to compromise its principles.

Now to proceed to an analysis of present conditions as they bear upon the position of the Church and to indicate the remedy. But first to cite some observations upon Christianity and the Church as recorded in a prominent secular periodical. The fact of the subject receiving hospitality in such a quarter implies that it is believed to possess a wider interest than might otherwise seem to be the case.

The reference is to a perspicacious article in the January-February number of the *Unpartizan Review* entitled "The Problem of Church-going" and signed "A Clergyman." The author considers candidly the decrease in church attendance which is so marked a feature of the present day and cites the reasons popularly given for the decay of the custom. Instances of the reaction to the church-going habit

as he has gleaned them from many different sources are submitted and his conclusion is that Christianity is a dead or dying thing, and must give way to a wholly new religion.

"Christianity" he says, "as organized in popular creeds and rituals and churches must perhaps pass away. Even so a new religion—some will insist upon calling it Christianity—and the name I am not interested in—will take its place. We have come to a time when, if the Church or *a* church is to remain in our midst, a new religion must be framed up. I believe that a new religion is slowly being shaped in our midst—in us, to meet the new needs, to inspire us to reach to the higher ideals and pursue nobler ends."

With much that the writer says, particularly with that portion of his article which sets forth the present conditions relative to the unpopularity of the Church and indifference to its ministrations there would seem to be small grounds for dissent on the part of any who are familiar with the situation. It must be clear to the least observant that a great religious apathy has set in everywhere and that the process is likely to continue indefinitely.

"Church-membership" as the writer observes, "is no longer a serious thing to the people—it is hardly a serious matter to the minister. Every minister knows how little cooperation and enthusiasm he can depend on from the members of his church. It is the faithful two or three—often not the three—that keep the church activities going. And every one of us is deeply worried to know where we shall find anyone to take the place of those who now so generously assume the burden. The membership of the churches is so much dead wood. The members no longer have any living faith. And as for moral or spiritual ambition they are utter strangers to it."

Allowing for rhetorical exaggeration there is surely a great deal of truth in the above statement, far too much to be lightly dismissed as the mere vaporings of a pessimist or the disingenuousness of one who writes with an intent to pander to the easily-aroused sentiment of dislike and antagonism towards dogmatic Christianity which this secularistic age cherishes.

The writer readily admits that the general indifference to the Church affects not merely the dogmatic and ritual churches or those which are supposed to be controlled by vested interests, but embraces all alike with its paralyzing touch.

"Churches," he observes, "that make a specialty of the 'Social Gospel' and 'new theology' or no theology seem to be as much beset by public indifference and antagonism as the more orthodox institutions. Revision of creeds—modernizing of methods and messages will not—at least does not, suffice to make the Church a real vital part of the world's work." He quotes a Roman Catholic lady as writing, "Christianity is passing. Our own leaders realize this and I have often heard good Catholics say that Christians may yet find themselves in the position that they were in the third century—a sort of oasis in the desert of new paganism." To this he adds his own comment "I suspect it would be a little nearer right to say that Christianity has itself become a desert—the oasis being the many beginnings of a new religion."

That there is a real rupture between the Church and the world, and that such rupture bids fair to become a deep and abiding one is in the opinion of the writer of this present article a matter rather for rejoicing than for regret. The sooner the Church is abandoned by those who do not prize

the supernatural benefits which alone it has to offer, the better for all concerned. "Two cannot walk together unless they are agreed." The old notion once widely held that a profession of Christianity carried with it the assurance of certain temporal advantages and blessings never had any foundation in fact, was distinctly injurious to the Church and contradicted the plain words of Christ. "In the world ye shall have tribulation"; "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake"; "Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you"; are some of the pregnant sayings bearing upon this subject. The consolations and promises of the Gospel are not to be reckoned in the terms of tangible earthly advantages, social, intellectual or political, but rather in terms of the spirit. "The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

The laboring classes, so called, have long since abandoned institutional Christianity and concentrated their hopes and energies upon their trade unions to which they look for the active sympathy and help which the Church is unable or disinclined to give. The capitalistic classes, if they still in some small measure continue to support the Church by their presence and money are gradually leaving it since they discovered that it has lost the popular favor and can no longer be depended upon to aid their cause by furnishing a buffer to radical and socialistic movements. Labor and capital finding the Church impotent to further their schemes, in both cases equally selfish and materialistic, have turned against it, the former denouncing it as the organ of political and social reaction and the latter rejecting it as an instrument no longer capable of rendering any efficient service in the fierce struggle against the rising tide of industrial democracy.

The Church because it rightly refuses to take sides in a class controversy but would fain be regarded as the friend of both parties, has come in the final issue to be looked upon as a social and political nonentity. Had the Church been willing unreservedly to embrace the cause of either class it would have gained perhaps a temporary advantage, but it would have lost its soul. As it is now neglected and derided there is hope that it may attain the beatitude belonging to those who for righteousness' sake are despised and rejected of men.

What the Church needs for the re-establishment of its moral supremacy is a little wholesome persecution. This is the one ground of hope. In the early days the Church was persecuted by the civil government because it refused to burn incense at the shrine of imperial Caesar whose image represented the supremacy of the state. We are seeing to-day a recrudescence under modern conditions of this same idea, only it is a democracy rather than an autocracy that demands the homage of men. Both are equally jealous of opposition. Both demand an unconditional obedience. The tyranny of a mass majority is no less oppressive than that of an individual ruler. With this new and mighty world-power the Church, if it would be faithful to its ideals, must sooner or later come into conflict and be prepared to suffer the penalties of its contumacy. There are signs that the age-long issue between Christ and Caesar will once more definitely be joined. When these things begin to come to pass then may the Church look up and lift up her head, for her redemption draweth nigh.

As for the individual, the day has long gone by when it was possible to urge as an incentive for embracing Christianity that such a profession yields temporal advantage,

but rather on the other hand the time has come to emphasize that such a profession imposes certain definite restrictions, irksome to those who wish to enjoy to the full the pleasures and freedom of a life lived in accordance with secular ideals. If in a former age it was perhaps possible to maintain that even a nominal church membership brought certain social benefits, such an argument has little weight today and will probably have none whatsoever in the future. It may be affirmed that few or none today take the trouble to inquire as to the religious convictions of those with whom they come in business or social contact. Everyone today is perfectly free, as far as the criticism of his associates is concerned, to make no profession of religion. It is in no degree counted against him if he abstains from connecting himself with any religious organization. Whether he holds views orthodox or heterodox interests few or none. Whether or no he attends a church service is regarded as a wholly personal matter with which others have no rightful concern. His moral character, his repute in the community, depends in no whit upon any profession of Christianity. It is a common saying that there are as many good people outside the churches as inside.

Now one main result of this altered attitude towards religion, which is so characteristic of the present day, is largely to diminish the number of merely nominal Christians. All extraneous pressure social and otherwise being removed, people feel themselves perfectly free to follow their dominant impulses. If, for instance, attendance at public worship be opposed to the inclinations and desires of the individual he feels not the slightest hesitation in omitting such a practice. If he prefers to lie abed late Sunday morning, to spend it in dawdling about the house, reading

the newspapers, in motoring or playing golf, he does so freely, conscious of incurring no open reproach. For his religious views and practices, so long as he preserves an outwardly respectable attitude, he feels accountable to no one. When, or if, attending a church service, he is conscious of receiving little or no benefit he naturally argues, since such is the case, that he might be better employed in doing the things that really gratify him. The modern frankness in adopting and justifying an attitude of indifference or hostility to religious practices is surely to be commended. Certainly it is far better to be honest about the matter, than to pretend an interest which is not felt.

The sooner religion is placed for all upon its true basis and divorced from any fictitious advantages the better for all concerned. The issue will then be accurately drawn and self deception be impossible. Religion gains nothing from the patronage of the world. The alliance of the two has never spiritualized the world and it has degraded and debased religion. In the rupture which is now going on between the two we may see a happy augury for the future of Christianity. There will be fewer lukewarm Christians and this will be a great gain. What the Church loses in mere numbers it will more than make up in definiteness, coherency and power. The world is slowly coming to see that the profession of Christianity imposes vital obligations upon its adherents, that the Christian vows ought to mean what they say, that they rightfully require a correspondence of the life to certain supreme ideals. Admittance to Christian privileges has heretofore been on too easy a basis. There has been no real testing of the individual, no submission to discipline has been exacted. The Church has been content to put forth its supernatural claims and to admit to

membership everyone who offered himself on the general undertaking to live a respectable life, or that is how it has been popularly construed. In place of a virile Christian faith the Church has seemed to be satisfied with a vague and hazy assent to certain theological formularies. The vow to renounce the world, the flesh and the devil has been so interpreted that it called for little self-sacrifice and discipline. The vow of obedience to divine commandments has come to mean merely such compliance with the moral law as would serve to render the person a decent member of civilized society according to the prevailing standards.

The world after several centuries of antagonism and persecution formally adopted Christianity but for the most part has little practiced it. The world has been conscious of certain benefits which it has received from Christianity, but now being in sure possession of the same, believes that it can get on very well without any further aid from that quarter. Not indeed that the world has yet repudiated conventional Christianity, or is ever likely to do so in favor of any other religion, but it has hitherto identified Christianity with moral and material progress and has had small regard for its supernatural side, its faith and love and worship.

Let no one imagine that the writer takes the harsh unscriptural view that the Church is only for the saints. It is indeed for sinners, but for sinners who faithfully mean to keep their Christian vows and willingly submit to the discipline which experience has proved to be necessary for weak and erring human nature. Under any conceivable circumstances there will always be in the Church Christians unworthy of the name they bear. This cannot be avoided nor is it anything but what is to be expected. The point is that the Church itself, while it ought to bear patiently with the

imperfect and the sinful, is not called upon to lower its standards, to admit to its fold or to retain in it, those who flout its discipline and reject its counsels. These things the Church has certainly done in the past and it is the great cause of its weakness today.

We are entering assuredly upon a new and better era. The world and worldly people more and more are going to separate themselves from the Church. They do not feel the need of it any longer and naturally will withdraw their presence and support. The time-worn plea that religion is a profitable thing for the community and for the individual no longer convinces and every intelligent Christian will be quick to acquiesce in this conclusion, unless the term "profitable" be interpreted in a distinctly esoteric sense. Doubtless a scheme of morality based upon utilitarian theories has never proved wholly satisfactory, but the experiment seems likely to be tried upon a large scale, and it may seem for a time to be successful. Signs indicate that all over the world the ancient alliance of Church and state is fast passing away. Church property in this country is now exempt from taxation, a proceeding which amounts indirectly to a subsidy by the state. Probably it will not be long before such exemption is done away with, and perhaps from a religious as well as a political standpoint, such a step is desirable. Churches in the past have derived some measure of their income from the generosity of outsiders or from the reluctant contributions of those whose membership was merely nominal. That source of supply will certainly cease as the conviction gains ground that religion is a private luxury rather than a public necessity. The education of the young has already been turned over to the state though it was formerly almost entirely entrusted to the Church.

Parents who are not themselves convinced Christians will hardly be persuaded in the future to bring their children to baptism or confirmation. Already the obligations assumed by godparents are lightly taken and even more lightly violated. Sentiment still dictates that marriages and burials be conducted under religious auspices but such practice is not likely to survive among those who have definitely cast off for themselves all religious convictions.

The question remains to be asked how will the changed conditions affect the Church and individual Christians? That the Church will be stronger and purer when it once dismisses from its mind any thought of conciliating the worldly and unreligious element, when it ceases to rely in any degree upon an arm of flesh and devotes its energies exclusively to its religious mission. It will continue even in greater measure than in the past to be a missionary body, but it will not water down its doctrines or make the conditions for admittance to its fold too easy. Emphasis will be laid upon the truth that a profession of Christianity demands an unconditional surrender of the will and the affections to a great ideal and presupposes a willingness to submit to a measure of godly discipline. The line of demarcation between the Church and the world will be more strongly defined. Christian liberty will not be shackled but a dangerous laxity will be condemned. The spiritual tone of the Church will be raised by the cultivation of a clearer conception among its members as to the significance of their Christian vows. The Church will require of sponsors in baptism that they make good the solemn obligations which they have assumed in presenting infants for reception into membership. Candidates for confirmation will be tested and not hurried into the reception of a rite for which they

have not been adequately prepared. Communicants who ignore their church duties will be placed under a wholesome discipline and no longer permitted to play fast and loose with their solemn vows. Does anyone believe that a Church thus constituted and governed will be less effective and influential in the proper sense than has been the case with the Church of the past? Too long the fiction that the Church was intended to include all mankind has held sway over men's minds. The Church is the leaven not the lump, the salt that gives savor, the beacon light that illuminates a naughty world, the City of God at unity in itself. The Church indeed must preach the Gospel to every creature, that is the command laid upon it by its Founder, but it is nowhere asserted that it would succeed in bringing all men into its fold. Everyone is to be given an opportunity to avail himself of the salvation offered in Jesus Christ but the issue still remains with the individual. "My sheep hear my voice, I know them and they follow me."

In the case of the individual Christian the altered conditions will require a deeper consecration and a more real self-discipline. More of his time, more of his substance and more of his energy will be demanded and accorded. In the face of the intellectual difficulties which modern scholarship and research have created he will have to learn as well as unlearn many things. Supreme draughts will be made upon his faith and patience. No longer will it suffice to repeat the old shibboleths and rehearse the old formulae. He will not be called upon to surrender any of the old fundamentals but he will be required to see and study them in a new light. Christianity upon its intellectual, disciplinary and practical sides will demand a fuller measure of self-sacrifice and consecration.

Absolutely divorced from any temporal and extraneous advantages Christianity will be seen to be what it has ever claimed to be, a supernatural religion, having indeed its sphere of operation upon this earth, and concerned with every department of our complex human nature, but holding out no false hope of temporal benefits and teaching its adherents patiently to await the great consummation for the vindication promised in the Gospel to those who love God and keep His commandments.

Spiritism as a Religion

Rev. Frank Gavin, S.S.J.E.

NO apology need be made for the choice of the subject of this paper. Europe is intensely interested in the questions arising from the war which touch nearly every family in the relation of their dead to the living. Particularly is this the case in England, where for the latter years of the war, a great number of books and pamphlets dealing with Spiritism have been making their appearance. In America we have felt the force of the movement which began here, gathered momentum in England, and is now returning, in the persons of its ablest apostles and their writings, to make converts among us. It is perhaps due to this fact above others, that the exponents of the principles of the religion of Spiritism have a hearing now in circles closed to its approach some years ago. Sir Oliver Lodge, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, the author of the poem "St. Paul," Sir William Barrett, are not men whose conclusions are lightly to be dismissed. There are few of us who, as priests, will not be called upon to take up some

position in regard to Spiritism as a religion. We shall be meeting more and more with those of our people who feel the distinct need, which Spiritism claims to satisfy, and we shall be compelled to do our best sympathetically to understand the problem presented with greater acuteness in these days after the war, which has so sharply accentuated the normal experience of mankind,—the loss by death of those dear to us. For ourselves, too, it is necessary to be aware of the movement of thought outside the Church, and to include in our philosophy of life, "whatsoever is true, whatsoever is good" which may be brought to light by the adventurous spirit of man.

In the following pages I shall attempt to deal with the problem of Spiritism as a religion, with relation to our faith. After defining the subject, I shall engage to outline the typical attitudes adopted toward the phenomena presented by Spiritism, and after a few comments by way of preliminary, present the contents of the "New Revelation," and compare it with the Catholic Revelation.

It is perhaps more correct to use the term "spiritism" than "spiritualism." The latter really is a philosophical term for the theory which holds that there is a spiritual order of beings and that the soul of man is spirit. "Spiritism" is, moreover, equivalent to the French "spiritisme," and the German "spiritismus." "Spiritualism," though the more common term, does not distinctly connote the fundamental doctrine which is the subject of this discussion. It is variously phrased. Sir Oliver Lodge ("The Survival of Man," p. 338) states as the conclusion of the modern research that "intelligent cooperation between other than embodied human minds and our own . . . . has become possible," and this is really the heart of spiritism as a

science. Spiritism, according to Dr. J. Liljencrants ("Spiritism and Religion," p. 9), "is founded upon the belief that the living can, and actually more or less at will do, communicate with the spirits of the departed." According to Mr. J. Arthur Hill ("Spiritualism, its History, Phenomena, Doctrine," p. 25) "its fundamental principle is, that human beings survive bodily death, and that occasionally, under conditions not yet fully understood, we can communicate with those who have gone before." The chief thesis is then two-fold: man survives bodily death, and the living may communicate with the dead. With the former part of the thesis there cannot be any disagreement between Christians and Spiritists. With the latter there have been many who have taken issue.

Three chief attitudes have been adopted toward the phenomena of Spiritism by those who do not believe in it. The first denies the evidence, and says that all the so-called phenomena are bosh. "These things do not happen" is a summary of this attitude. So held Münsterberg and Tyndall, and such an attitude is the usual one for those who will not consent to examine the phenomena at all, and make their conclusion in advance, upon purely *a priori* reasoning. Huxley was simply uninterested in it, though he carefully guarded against the unscientific view that any such phenomena were "impossible." Spiritism was simply not on his horizon. This attitude that "it is all nonsense and humbug" is of course unscientific and unsatisfactory, and cannot long be held. The second attitude is of those who may admit the phenomena, but are not at all convinced by the evidence. Their attitude, as Lt. Col. McTaggart says (in "The Change after Death: a Case for Logic" — the *Nineteenth Century*, Dec. 1919), is "merely agnostic." The

so-called "proofs" he says . . . "leave me singularly unmoved" (p. 1098). Others reason against the evidence (the Bishop of Chelmsford, in the *Church Times*, Mar. 1, 1918) by saying that "it is beneath the dignity of the future life" that such communications should be of the sort Spiritists claim. The evidence is too trivial to support the conclusions (Prebendary A. Caldecott, at a Conference on "Life after Death" reported in the *Church Family Newspaper*, Nov. 2, 1917). The case presented in "Raymond" for example, Mr. Alfred W. Martin says, "is not proven." ("Sir Oliver Lodge and Objective Evidence for Life after Death" *The Standard*, vol. iv, 7, April, 1918.) Bishop Gore does not deny the phenomena but says it is "healthier to believe in a future life because of our faith in God, than to rest our belief in such piecemeal phenomena" (in *Church Times*, March 23, 1917). Fr. Longridge's pamphlet comes to much the same conclusion, presenting a catena of expressed opinions of all shades against the claims of Spiritism. Dr. John Liljencrants' Doctorate Thesis, "Spiritism and Religion," admits the phenomena, but attempts to show that they all can be accounted for by the action of purely natural forces, and that the full case for Spiritism is not proven. Telepathy and the other actions of the subconscious mind are credited with a large share of these phenomena which are not provably spurious.

The third attitude is not as negative as the above which I have been attempting to indicate. The case for Spiritism is not only not proven, according to Fr. Bernard Vaughan, for example, but its genuine phenomena do attest the presence and operation of evil spirits. So, too, Fr. Brosnan (in "Fact vs. Dogma," in the *Nineteenth Century*, Dec. 1919), T. L. Harris ("Modern Spiritualism"), Fr. Perrone, S.J.

(*"De Virtute Religionis"*), G. Raupert ("Modern Spiritualism," "The Dangers of Spiritualism"), etc. This is mainly the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church, and would doubtless be that as well of the Greek Orthodox Church, were the question of interest enough to them to be an issue. It is probably that of the Rev. T. J. Hardy, in "Spiritism in the Light of Faith," which I have not yet read. No loyal Roman Catholic can go to a seance, or in any way take part in the worship of spiritistic meetings, or attempt to induce or cooperate in table-tippings, automatic writing, etc. Dr. Liljencrants believes the extreme position of ascribing spiritistic phenomena to evil spirits to be unwarranted, as he holds that they can be accounted for by natural forces alone, though this is not as yet capable of definite proof.

I have spoken of these three attitudes of complete or partial rejection of Spiritism. The first rejects phenomena and conclusions; the second admits the evidence but not the conclusions; the third admits the evidence, as probably true, but says it proves something else. There are all kinds and degrees of endorsement,—from cautious assent up to enthusiastic proselytism. So the reviewer (H. Adye Prichard in the *Churchman* for March 13, p. 25), "Spiritism we believe is a new development of Christianity — perhaps the most important development that has shown itself since the Day of Pentecost," who in thus speaking is more enthusiastic even than Conan Doyle in "The New Revelation."

It is not within my province to examine the phenomena of Spiritism, nor to question even its two chief theses: the survival of personal identity after death, and the possibility of communications between the living and the dead. I wish to examine the content of the revelations which purport to be

the outcome of spirit intercourse, and to compare it with Catholic theology. My field is much the same as that of Hardy in his recent book. Waiving the question then of the facts, and admitting that the spirits of the dead do have intercourse with the living, what is the burden of their communications, when they purport to relate to the new life into which they have entered? What do they tell us about God? Of what sort is the "revelation" which Spiritism claims to make? What is the content of the teaching of Spiritism as a religion?

Before outlining in brief this "revelation" I wish to make a few comments at this point. The methods of intercourse are usually one of the three following: by the ouija-board, through automatic writing, and through a medium. In the first two methods of communication the sitter does not need another human intermediate between himself and the spirit with whom he is holding communication. By using a medium there are usually four personalities engaged: the sitter, the medium, the spirit and the "control," through whom the spirit communicates with the medium. It is obvious that in the former two methods there is a less great probability of misinformation due to human means, inasmuch as there are only inanimate objects used in transmission. The use of the medium involves a person, whose will and reason, though in temporary abeyance, cannot really be abrogated and cease to have some influence on the messages, even granting good-will and integrity of intention. So there is considerable difficulty in the transmission of messages: a disembodied spirit has to use material means to convey information to living humans. According to spiritists' own statements, this is one of the greatest difficulties in the way of ready intercourse. We

must keep this fact in mind, and not expect the sort of accurate, immediate and complete returns which might come were the mechanics of communication perfected. Furthermore, granting again the spiritists' hypothesis, the lack of coherence and consistency in the various communications, both as regards the individual message, and in the relation of one to any other, may be influenced greatly by the personality of the medium, the difficulty of transmission, and above all, by the stage of development and knowledge attained by the spirit himself. I have not seen this feature stressed in their apologetic, but it seems to me that the spiritists could make a great point of this fact in claiming veridicity for their revelations. They are exactly of the seemingly contradictory and divergent types that would be made by different normal humans at different stages in their spiritual progress. We must not then expect a relentless consistency in doctrine, for the revelations imparted to us may be from various people in various stages of enlightenment. Last of all, Spiritism does not claim to be a complete philosophy as yet; revelation is a gradual process, not complete at any one time. Scarcely any fact is more true to our experience than this character of graduation in the doctrine inculcated in what purports to be revelation.

I do believe, however, that there are certain fundamental principles which have been promulgated as by revelation, and accepted by spiritists as a common ground of the content of their belief. I am including the reincarnation theory, which has ardent supporters in the East, and in France and Germany. There is still a common substratum of spiritistic teaching which can be paralleled with Christian dogma. The seven chief principles, for example, are as follows, according to Mr. Hanson G. Hey's pamphlet (he

is the Secretary of the Spiritualists' National Union of Great Britain) : the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of man, continuous existence, communion of spirits and the ministry of angels, personal responsibility, compensation and retribution after life on earth, and the "path of endless progression" (p. 19). He denies that spiritists have a creed, but says they have principles only. Earth life is the life of a spirit "temporarily inhabiting this tenement of clay for purposes of experience" (p. 3). The spirit *is* the man, then, and the body is a kind of house in which he lives, then abandons, as he does an outworn suit of clothes. Such is the illustration used repeatedly by Sir Oliver Lodge. As regards future life, heaven and hell, Hey says: "No man deserves bliss for the good he can do . . . in his earthly career . . . . nor however bad, deserves the other extreme" (ibid, p. 33). Of the necessity of faith, personal and corporate, all spiritistic publications treat exhaustively. Lack of belief is one of the greatest bars to self-revelation and to communications. Lack of faith in the control, as in Miss Cameron's book, is a constant hindrance to transmission of messages. The kind of faith Sir Oliver Lodge emphasizes is the kind of tentative trial, with a rather more than open mind, which adequate evidence would tend to induce. That which most of the messages would seem to suggest is a still more utter abandonment of self,—of one's will and judgment, a kind of Pauline adherence and abnegation of the whole personality, to the direction and guidance of the influencing spirit. Lack of faith on the part of one's relatives and dear ones is practically the only cause of grief to those who have "passed over," as the phrase is, since it militates against the possibility of communication. We must believe in their present

life, and in the possibility of getting in touch with them, and then after this, make the still larger venture of constant submission of self to their direction from beyond the grave.

One book I have read is an extremely powerful presentation of a series of "revelations." I refer to "The Seven Purposes" by Margaret Cameron. It is well written, well organized, and effectively presented. The heart of the book consists of a series of oracular encyclicals emanating from a kind of headquarters of "higher forces." They are, in the main, of a lofty and exalted tone. The "seven purposes" seem to be seven dominant life influences or tendencies, such as "healing," "light," "building," "progress," etc., by alignment with which one finds his companions for eternity, after he has "passed over." Much of the incidental elements in this book seem to me significant, such as e. g., the recurrent emphasis on "faith," on the author's part, as the only possible means to allow the revelation to "come through." God seems to be left out of the theology,—and has become the "Great Force." It is, if anything, of a decidedly pantheistic turn of thought, and is a rather fine and austere example of some of the best revelation documents. God is spoken of occasionally as a personality, but more often in this pantheistic way. He is incomprehensible, infinite, and unknowable in Himself. No one has claimed to have seen Him. He is known only in His works. He is Love, and manifests Himself as Wisdom, Truth, and Justice. Liljencrants summarizes this aspect of the theology of Spiritism (op. cit. p. 250).

Meyers' revelations, which were made some years ago, are more stoic in their general aspect. "Cooperation with the cosmic law" is a phrase of his ("Human Personality,"

II. p. 284). All revelations agree as to a kind of gradual ascent. There are "spheres" of life beyond, and that into which one usually goes after death is nearest the earth, from which one's interests are gradually withdrawn to center themselves on further stages in the progress. The departed spirit is met after death by others; he is given a body and lives an intense and busy life. Various and conflicting details are given in different messages. He is working under direction, is engaged on work which is part of a highly organized and complex scheme, and finds it full of interest. He receives instruction regularly, and, when competent, passes along into a higher sphere.

Various things have been said of our Lord. No passage in "Raymond" was to me so poignantly affecting as Raymond's account of his vision (pp. 230-33) of our Lord. Christ's interest is chiefly with this planet, to which He came to teach men by His example, to lead them to the realization of a more ideal life. There is, of course, no complete contour in the revelation regarding Him; it seems to be in the works I have examined quite as unknown a territory as it was to the minds of the various persons concerned. I mean that our Lord appeared to be just about the sort of Person as He had been held to be by the various persons when they lived in the flesh. No really fuller revelation has come in this particular, except, perhaps, to make what they had held, glow with a greater power.

A sin, according to the "Seven Purposes," is more a mistake or an error in choice, than viciousness of nature, or an incorrigible perversity of will which is beyond the sinner's power to correct. The moral aspect of the after-life seems to be a kind of "school of self-help," in which the individual is supplied with that which he can appropriate if he

will, by way of his own spiritual development. There are good spirits and unruly or vicious ones, who frequently "butt into" the lines of communication, and puzzle people here on earth. Men have complete freedom of will. Death is not a magic, by which a sinner is changed suddenly into a saint. He goes on growing and developing along the lines and tendencies of character he has already formed. There is waywardness and self-will. Education, patient instruction, and example will correct this. There is no hell. This preparatory course is a kind of painless purgatory.

It is apparent that there is almost nothing positive added by spiritistic revelation to the content of the Faith as Catholics hold it. With most of the "seven principles" of the spiritist's platform Christians are in a fair way of agreement. We believe in the Fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man, in free-will, in compensation and retribution after death, in the survival of the soul after departing this life, and, in a sense, in the "path of endless progression." From one point of view, Spiritism is simply another Protestant sect, emerging as have the others, to correct and supplement some lacuna in explicit teaching on the part of the Church: the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, and the state of our dead. It is, like true Protestantism, individualistic, rejective of authority, and negative. Its negations will have to be erased if it is to survive for long. Its affirmations are in the realm where Christian thought has already spoken before. It does, in a sense, furnish new reasons for believing in some of the old things,—as all Protestant theology does when it is constructive.

At the same time, it is hopelessly Protestant along certain definite channels. It denies, either expressly, or by implication, certain cardinal doctrines of the Faith. There

was no "fall" of man, for example, but the "scientific" spiritists, who are thorough-going evolutionists, point only to a progress upward, in all of man's life, both body and spirit. There is, in consequence, no need for the Incarnation, except as a revelation of the love of God. I would remind my readers of the very primitive divergence in Christian thought (which really developed into antagonism) of two views of our Lord's life and work. One aspect regarded Him only as "Revealer,"—and, in consequence, not essentially God Incarnate. Jesus might have been less than God, and yet made a new revelation of God's love and character to man. Another view pictured Him as Saviour and Redeemer, who died on the Cross for mankind, offering Himself as Atonement for the sin of the world, redeemed man, and perpetuated His Presence, His life, and His work in His mystical Body, His Church. To this latter view belongs the whole sacramental line of thought, one implication of which is the dignity of matter as the expression of mind, and the fundamental and essential union of the material and spiritual. I need hardly suggest that of these two views the former is more congenial to the Protestant mind, while both are needed to constitute the picture of the Saviour in Catholic devotion and thought. The second type is wholly lacking in Spiritism. There is no room for more than a heroic example of honesty, unselfishness, purity and holiness in the life of Jesus, if sin is a mistake and error rectifiable by one's own efforts, and within one's own power to correct, and of no eternal or necessarily permanent significance. An example and a code will suffice, if ethics is rational, and if sin can be cured by instruction. There is, then, no need for the Atonement, or the Redemptive Work of our Lord. Nor is there any need for His Resurrection,—

in fact, the Resurrection, as Catholics have held it, is a complete anomaly in the spiritistic scheme. I was much struck by the resemblance, in general content, of Sir Oliver's explanation of the Resurrection in the latter part of his "Science and Immortality," and Kirsopp Lake's essay on "The Resurrection of our Lord." Both come to the same conclusion, and this conclusion is impossible of reconciliation with the Catholic Faith.

That there is no room for the Catholic teaching as to the future state of the departed is quite apparent. Sir Arthur is most explicit on this point in his "New Revelation" (pp. 54-8. 68). He rejects emphatically the Church's traditional teaching about the Atonement, and about heaven and hell. "Christianity must change or must perish" is his terse comment on the relation of the "New Revelation" to the old (ibid. p. 54). He is quite consistent and logical, and his integrity and sincerity cannot be questioned. He presents the issue clearly: the "New Revelation" is authoritative and is to supplant the old. We cannot but be grateful to him for presenting the matter so concisely.

Of innumerable other matters I shall not attempt a discussion. It is morally wrong so completely to abrogate the possession and use of one's will and faculties, especially for the use of unknown and unproved general agencies, as must be done as a condition to mediumship, or even as making possible automatic writing. Such a gift of the self is only for God. Furthermore, Spiritism certainly does not make for loyal and whole-hearted allegiance to the Church, which is a significant and discernible pragmatic test. I cannot see where the fundamental ethical basis rests in the religion of Spiritism. "Higher" and "lower" means something only on the basis of a standard. In short, if the content of the new

revelation of Spiritism can be shown to have a complete and utter opposition to Catholic truth,—as I believe it has—I cannot see what other answer we can give, than to condemn it by the standard of the "faith once delivered to the saints," to teach those doctrines of the faith which it spurns, and as well those which it claims to teach upon a new basis, with redoubled emphasis and vigor.

The Social Message of the Church

Rev. Floyd S. Leach, Ph.D.

IT is intensely interesting to note the reaction of both clergy and laity when the subject of social service is introduced. One's own experience is likely to linger long; and my own memory is very fresh. The first response to the social message of the Church is almost always one of respectful apathy. A hearing is accorded, but it is one in which is mingled a mild mental antagonism and a reserved air which says, "Well, we are interested to see what you are going to do about it." Gross misconceptions are far more prevalent than one would hope to find. Of course, social service workers are not agreed on a definition of social service, and there is always the temptation, which is usually yielded to, to conceive of one's own work as the very quintescence of social work. I must, therefore, urge that you remember throughout this paper, that I am looking through my own eyes. I can treat the subject only as I see it and where I may seem to be dogmatic others have the right and privilege of being equally dogmatic from a very different point of view. The final test must be the empirical and what may appear to the reason as most nearly con-

forming to the demands of the situation. My own handling of the subject must, therefore, depend upon my ability to appeal to your own experience and common sense.

In the beginning I would rule out some conceptions of social service. A short time ago I heard a very prominent bishop make the statement that our own Joint Commission on Social Service have evidently been better students of Karl Marx than of our Lord. Regretfully many of us felt that the bishop had expressed our own thoughts. The social message of the Church is a reform movement and also a revolutionary movement, but these facts cannot identify it with Socialism or Syndicalism simply because they too are revolutionary movements. It is to be deeply regretted that social service and Socialism should be in any way connected in the minds of so many for there is no legitimate similarity. The great movement for making over this world so as to more nearly conform to the mind of our Lord, is not a political program. It is a great guiding spiritual impulse which finds its practical expression in a growing and developing effort to construct and remake our social relations on a truly Christian basis.

A second preliminary observation is that social service is not philanthropy. Probably nearly every clergyman in or about a large metropolitan center has had repeated experiences with Charity Organization Societies. There are many of us who feel that they come as close to giving a perfect example of "cold charity" as we are likely to get. When we want to give some suspicious beggar a good solid "freeze out" we send him to the C. O. S. We must, however, have some Christian charity for the C. O. S., for that organization is doing a magnificent work in its way; but we must remember that it is attacking the problem of poverty from

the aspect of a quarter of a century ago in the Teutonic spirit. By this I mean that on final analysis it is striving to abolish poverty by relieving it and approaches each new case in the attitude that it is already condemned and the burden of proof of innocence rests upon the suppliant. The Charity Organization movement is struggling hard to perfect its methods and organization and in ways is doing really constructive work in attacking dangerous institutions.

Nor must we be blinded by certain shibboleths. Our larger hospitals have what they call social service departments. Their work is most salutary, but they are exceedingly circumscribed and narrow. They represent a kind of philanthropic work under the name of social service by adding an efficiency to medical and surgical treatment and on the whole deal with individuals rather than with related communities or human relations within communities. They, in common with other philanthropies, come into contact with social institutions; but their work is not primarily centered upon the institution, but on the individual. As an example hospital social service, as well as all philanthropic organizations, repeatedly meets the problem of alcoholism. It has been one of the greatest difficulties in their work; but they have treated the individual cases in a remedial way rather than attacking the social institution of the saloon. I doubt whether any important philanthropic agency has really championed a movement for the solution of the liquor problem as a social institution.

One other aspect needs brief attention. There are many so-called social workers who look upon the Church as fulfilling its mission only when it becomes their financial agent. I have in mind a man who was in college with me.

Finally he drifted into the housing reform movement. He told me a few years ago, when I chanced to meet him, that he had no use for the Church. He had gone to one of the churches in his community and tried to get it to finance his work and it had declined to do so. Of course, the Church is wrong when it refuses to be a money bag from which every welfare worker can draw unlimited funds for him to spend as *he* sees fit!

In the evolution of society the Church must be satisfied when it *gets* many things done rather than continues to do them. There was the time when it was necessary for the Church to institute and to conduct great works of charity and of mercy. Its divine commission has undoubtedly been to establish hospitals, homes and refuges. There was the time when the poor and the sick must suffer unless the Church were to succor them. Neither private nor public charities existed. To care for the suffering with material ministrations was to do a work in advance of the times. This program of the Church, which was remedial, probably met the situation better than any other for that stage of our civilization which the Church instituted and carried on by its great philanthropic works. Then happened a miracle. The Church demonstrated to the world that the divine attribute of mercy was the duty of all mankind. Philanthropy was shown to be not merely a privilege but a duty which could not be dodged. Accordingly, the state has been so far Christianized that it recognizes as its duty what the Church considered its own peculiar duty a century ago. Now the state is so far Christianized that it acknowledges that it must not permit preventable suffering from poverty or disease. That is a long step in the evolution of mankind. Let the pessimist who says that the world is not growing

better compare the state of a century ago when its chief functions were to make war and to punish criminals with that of today when it finds its present ideal in relieving the distresses of its citizens. Already the state has far outstripped the Church in its works of mercy on account of its greater resources through its right of taxation. It is true that we still need Church hospitals, Church homes, and Church refuges of all kinds; but more as an example for standardization than anything else. There also still rests upon the Church the heavy responsibility of infusing into the state the spiritual aspect and motive. The Church, however, can no longer consider that its highest divine mission is to relieve physical suffering. The state has caught the vision and has put the Church out of competition in the extent of its remedial ministries. Many mourn the fact; but it is the greatest cause of congratulation that the Church has accomplished so much in raising civilization to the level of its own divine vision of a century ago.

All of this means that the burden of the Church's activities has been taken out of its hands; but it does not mean that the Church has nothing further to do, and might as well go out of business. On the other hand, it is like loosing a millstone from its neck in that it is relieving the Church so that it may apply its vision and energies and resources to higher things. Today the vision of the Church must be not relief, but prevention. Upon its shoulders must rest the heavy burden of inspiring men to mould the program of the kingdom of God. That means the infusion of the spirit of Christ into the great movements of the day. It does not necessarily mean that it shall draft the programs but it does mean that it shall furnish the standards to which those programs must measure up. The Church need not draft its

program for meeting the great social problems of the day; but it must inject the Christian spirit into those programs so that they will do Christ's work. We clergy need to realize at times that we are not omniscient specialists. We have the right to claim the prerogative of testing spiritual results; but we cannot claim to be the only ones with a vision of the *modus operandi.*

We need to remember that the greatest work in religious history has been done by laymen. We are often reminded that the great prophets were not priests but laymen. Still we must remember that even the great prophets have a background in the priestly office for they could have done comparatively nothing without the mighty inspiration of the priest. They did not do their supreme work of themselves; but only as they stood upon the shoulders of the priests. It is true that the priesthood provided a very poor foundation, and the prophets might have done a far greater work if the priesthood had stood higher and straighter and stronger. The fact remains that their background was the priesthood, which had kept the fires burning on God's altar and from which even the prophets caught the divine spark. The same thing is true in our own day. The great philanthropies in our midst are not the works of the clergy but of the laity. The Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, the Charity Organization Society, the great relief societies which have done so much for Belgium, Serbia, France and the other war-stricken countries are not headed nor run by the clergy; but they are the ways in which the laity are exercising their priesthood. Still these same laity are not the radicals who scoff at God and religion. They are the men who have had their hearts set on fire from God's altars. We have a permissible pride in the great

numbers of our own laity who have founded and carried on these great works. It is a matter of common knowledge that our own Church laity have been mighty men who have stood head and shoulders above all others in the Liberty Loan, the Red Cross and the Welfare Organizations drives. Think not for an instant that they would have shown such devotion, self-sacrifice, enthusiasm and successful accomplishments had they not been nurtured at our altars; and, when the need arose had their hearts blaze forth with a divine power and compassion before which no opposition could stand. The fiery heat of the Holy Spirit's working melted down every barrier. All honor to them; but let us remember that back of them stands the priest at the altar.

This should give us the key to the present social message of the Church. The world is not looking to the Church to furnish programs to deal with the social conditions of the day. There is little confidence that the Church, which is very largely guided and governed by the clergy, has the necessary knowledge, training or experience, to formulate programs for society, business or politics. Such a conclusion is right. On the other hand, the world does look to the Church to furnish the moral and spiritual standards and the principles to be obtained. Within the Church are multitudes of highly educated, trained and experienced laymen. The problem resolves itself into getting the thing done rather than in doing it; and the task of the Church is to furnish the message rather than the program. It is futile to suppose that the ills and wrongs of life are to be righted by a machine-made system. Government alone is a wretched failure, "because men are superior to machinery and what men invent men can thwart. . . . The one instrument which by constitution, inheritance, and action is fitted

to alter the moral views of man" can alone affect our present state of affairs. "That instrument is religion and the agency by which it is to be brought to the public mind is the Church. So true is this that latterly even medicine, the most empirical of sciences, has come to recognize the therapeutic value of prayer and spiritual exercises. Well, if the attitude which prayer brings to the human mind and spirit can affect a mental disease in the individual, prayerfulness on the part of the public mind certainly can affect the operations of government." Our modern social institutions are grounded in ignorance of spiritual processes and spiritual inspirations; and they have lacked these "because Christianity as a social and governmental force has never been brought to the attention of the people as a part of their necessary religion. The expansion of Christianity in this respect would bring almost instantaneous relief, because whatever else it brought it would reveal the inevitable antagonism between the practices which are based on falsehood and those which live by and through the truth."

The social message of the Church, then, is supremely one of inspiration and enlightenment in spiritual values. It must set standards by which every program is tested and every life guaged. It must go back to basic and fundamental principles rather than to specific remedies. The characteristic of our day is that it is an age of "triumphant quackery." Not a few of the scientists themselves have unconsciously perhaps yielded to the insistent demand for reforms of one kind or another to produce remedies for the long standing ills of society. "As a result it is possible now-a-days to cite names of first rate repute for almost any folly, whether it has to do with government, law, medicine, business or religion." The curse of social reform is rampant

quackery and has tried not without success to enlist the Church. It is this quackery that has brought social work into ill repute with many and thrown sand into all of our eyes. The issue is not individual programs so much as basic principles.

To all of this many will say that my view of social work is indefinite and devoid of practical results. Again I would interpose that there is abundant opportunity for effective work. Mr. Louis Wallis takes what I consider the impractical view in his Introduction to "The Sociological Study of the Bible" from which I have quoted freely in preceding paragraphs. He says, "More and more we hear it said that the church machinery should put itself behind projects of social reforms—such as liquor legislation, child-labor laws, unionism, socialism, etc. If the church should lend itself to social reform, it would have to take up some definite position with regard to politics and economics. But men have always differed about politics; and if this view of church life prevails, those who do not favor the particular program adopted by their church cannot support their organization; and this would convert the church into a political party. . . . The witness of history is in favor of the complete separation of Church and State." Here I must protest. Men have never agreed on anything, and the Church can never be a molly-coddle if it is to be true to its Master. Furthermore, Mr. Wallis concludes wrongly that to champion a social cause will convert the Church into a political party. There is all the difference in the world between partisan politics and moral issues in politics. To champion or oppose a program on moral and spiritual grounds is non-partisan and imperative. The Church is bound by her fundamental constitution to fight the evil and to champion the good where-

ever found whether in the state or in the Church. Furthermore, Church and state are not separate compartments of life any more than the religious and the secular. They are mutually interdependent and complementary.

Specifically, then, what is the Church to do? First, there are specific things which the Church demands. There is no question about the divorce evil. The Church is officially committed to a program here and there can be no excuse for failure to fight for it. The question of vice is definitely set forth and here again the Church has a specific duty. There are other definite movements to which the Church is unqualifiedly committed.

Secondly, there are other questions in which the Church has taken no definite stand except in principle. The amusement question cannot be treated today with "Thou shalt," and "Thou shalt not;" but it has great fundamental principles of right and wrong such as sexual morality, the proper use of money and time. The labor problems are in a flux. The Church cannot produce a program; but it must demand that any program offered shall stand the moral and spiritual tests of fair play, and the golden rule; and it can go further in inspiring its laity to produce solutions for the relations of capital and labor which shall rest upon the spirit of the Gospel of our Lord.

A worthy example of a specific piece of work that ought to be emphasized is in the "Citizen's Pledge" issued by the Social Service Commission of the Diocese of New York. It is illustrative of the inspiration and educated conscience that ought to apply to all of our social problems. That pledge reads as follows:

> "I BELIEVE that it is the duty of every Christian man to exercise his responsibilities to the State and Nation.

THEREFORE, I pledge myself to look upon the responsibilities of my citizenship as duties which I owe to God.

THEREFORE, I will do all in my power to aid the cause of righteous citizenship and to persuade others so to do.

I PROMISE to exercise my influence to secure the nomination and election of none but fit men for public office.

I PROMISE to cast my ballot at every election; to accept jury service unless honestly prevented."

When the members of the Church approach every social problem on their knees in such a spirit there can be no question as to the final results.

Finally, I would reiterate my position that the social message of the Church is the infusion of the spiritual and the Christian view-points into our social life and as a message or as a gospel rather than as a program. It must depend on its laity for the programs, but the Church must furnish both the dynamic inspiration for the formulation of the programs and the form by which they are to be tested. The supreme goal must be the moulding of our present social structure into the kingdom of God here upon earth where the spiritual principles shall be the ideal toward which all strive. This, I believe, is the Gospel of Jesus Christ as enunciated by the Master, but applied to the life of today.

. . . . . .

A strong feeling exists in the minds of many Churchmen for a further treatment of our subject in which strategy as well as tactics shall be emphasized. There is considerable

uncertainty as to how the Church may wisely attack the social problems of the day. Four definite suggestions might well be added to the principles already enunciated.

1. Christian missions are not only a religious duty but a most imperative patriotic opportunity. China, Japan and other non-Christian populous countries are adopting much of our civilization and culture. They are appropriating our science, politics and commercial life. If their ideals and religion differ from our own the time is not far distant when they will be a menace. German methods and ideals have been more largely introduced into Japan than those of any other country. International peace will be stable only in proportion to the degree of real Christianity these countries may possess. Missions are not a religious problem alone, but the supreme international question and should be most emphatically placed before this country as such.

2. The proper use of money needs the strongest emphasis at this time. Our people should not be condemned either for their possession of money or that they spend it. The purpose of its use should cause grave concern. An index of the times is to be found at the shops of the grocer and the butcher every morning. Women do their marketing in their party gowns, in silks, satins, furs and high heels, and with their fingers covered with jewels. Late every evening long lines may be seen waiting for admission to popular "movies." The point of attack is that vast amounts of money are spent, not for service, but for selfish satisfactions. This one fact is making us the most sordid nation in the world and we must either bring the vision of Christian service as supreme to this nation or it will disintegrate through its selfishness.

3. The Christian standards cannot be attained at a

single bound. The Church must be content in reaching its ideal by steps. The question of uniform laws for marriage and divorce are cited as puzzling because the best proposals are so far below the standard of the Church. We must remember that our Lord's commentary on the Mosaic law of divorce was: "For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept." The Church must take the position of her Lord that even though a reform or a movement does not reach the Christian standard it may and should be championed as a step towards the ideal. This principle of holding the ideal but acknowledging the shortcomings of humanity and so doing the expedient rather than the ideal as a tentative position is, to my mind, a method of our Lord applicable to many of our social relations.

4. The relation of the pulpit to social problems is very wisely and perhaps most effectively dealt with by the rector of one of our metropolitan parishes. His Men's Association has been frankly told that the rector expects to place problems before the congregation from time to time. He will not be dogmatic, but rather state the problem to them. In so doing he is placing the responsibility for the further consideration and practical dealing with it upon them, and he will expect the president of the Association to appoint immediately a committee to consider the problem, to advise the rector and to institute effective ways and means for dealing with it in the light of Christian principles.

When the Church will thus identify our social life with its religious principles and activities, and practically apply its great dynamic power to treating the greatest as well as the smallest problems of life as a religious and patriotic duty, it will have truly planted the leaven to lighten the whole lump.

Our Lesser Ladies of July

Minna Caroline Smith

IN the Treasury of Devotion your interest has doubtless been attracted to the Table of Lesser Feast Days. A dozen of these feasts are for saints who were—and are —women. Our Lady has many festivals during the year; these feasts of the lesser ladies are kept by us with at least special collects.

There are three of these ladies' days during this month of July. St. Margaret's Day is July 20, as members of the large Sisterhood of the name and all these ladies' friends and associates have happy reasons to remember. Since professional nurses have become so plentiful these Sisters have given to other works also their devoted attention both in England and in this country.

The story of St. Margaret of Antioch (in Pisidia) is more fragmentary than that of many saints. She was the daughter of a heathen magistrate,—priest or king or both, tales vary,—whom she left because of his strenuous opposition to the Christian faith. Her mother was dead and she took refuge with her old nurse in the country, and kept sheep for her like Jeanne d'Arc in later centuries. On a summer's day when she was about eighteen this fair maiden attracted the notice of the local Roman "tyrant" Olybrious, who, ordering her before him at his palace, promptly declared his passionate admiration,

"If thou art a slave, I will buy thee; if a free woman, I will marry thee!"

She answered, "I am a free woman born, but may not be thy wife, for I am servant to our Lord Jesus Christ."

Incensed at her refusal, Olybrious cast her into prison. The open air young girl suffered greatly in the noisome place, and was grievously tempted to accept the ruler's offer of marriage, for he promised that she should be free and happy and rule his will. She said afterwards that in her temptation the "old dragon swallowed her whole," but by holding up the sign of the cross she was delivered and all her happiness stayed upon Jesus, her Lord. So she was delivered from the devil. In art she is shown sometimes as coming out of the dragon's mouth, the cross in her hand. For her chosen devotion Margaret was put to death, a virgin martyr. Her cult began early and grew rapidly; because of her great love to Jesus in days of trial, she is the special patron of expectant mothers. She became a favorite of our English forbears as numerous churches dedicated to her in England show. St. Margaret, Queen of Scotland, is another story.

St. Mary Magdalene's Day is July 22. Doctors of theology in the Greek and Latin Church disagree about her life, her death and her burial. Whether the same Mary twice anointed Jesus, or two different women, whether or not she was sister to Lazarus, there is lively difference of opinion among hagiographers—a distressing sort of word for specialists on saints' stories, isn't it?

Sister Anne Emmerich of the Rhine land who, about a hundred years ago, had a series of visions of the contemporary life of our Lord says quite simply in effect that this Mary was sister of Martha and Lazarus, that she was away from home at Magdala and elsewhere during her youth, that she was converted at the time of her first deed of anointing, but afterwards fell from grace, lived again in sin, causing much anxiety to the Blessed Mother of our Lord

and to other holy mission women. After her second conversion she remained true to the faith and to its practice, and this was the time when again she anointed in deep penitence her Saviour. Later she was afflicted with a semi-hysterical silence, and after her return to her family home at Bethany sat a great deal alone in the garden, and was healed and enabled to pray and give herself to contemplation by the coming of Jesus to his friends' home. Healed, she again became active, and was of course among the women last at the cross and first at the tomb, the one to whom Jesus spoke after his resurrection.

The Greek Church says that St. Mary Magdalene went to St. John the Divine at Ephesus, died there and was buried in the cave known as the Cave of the Seven Sleepers! Her relics were afterwards taken to the monastery of St. Lazarus. A Latin story is that Lazarus went to live in Gaul, taking his two sisters with him, and that Mary lived and died in a cave above Marseilles. She is first named in martyrology in the eighth century. In art her most glorious representation is by the great Spanish painter Ribera. When I saw this picture in Madrid it was hanging in a club, but has since been placed in a public gallery. She is shown with flowing hair, in a royal-colored, yet tattered robe, borne heavenward attended by happy children, cherubs like those in Murillo's Madonnas.

St. Anne's Day is July 26. This feast of the mother of Saint Mary has long been an increasingly beloved holy-day. Her cult began in earliest Christian days. Aprocryphal literature, especially the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary, glows with stories of St. Anne. A favorite tale is of her intense concentration in prayer for the blessing of a child, because her husband St. Joachim, had been refused honor and

duty in the temple because he had no children. The likeness is plain to the story of the other Anna, mother of the prophet Samuel; and the dedication by both women of their heaven-given children. St. Anne was sister of St. Elizabeth, mother of St. John Baptist. Plainly this was a family who knew their old Scriptures, and were faithful in prayer and sacrifice. A mystic's book published in Paris late in the sixteenth century names St. Emerentia as mother of St. Anne, and the current translation of the Latin legends about her gives both women qualities usually attributed only to St. Mary herself.

St. Anne's intercessions have long been sought for their power in healing. Her shrines at Beaupré, in Canada, and in New York, are crowded with crutches of cripples healed and at every yearly celebration of her day numerous pilgrims ask this saint to pray for their cure, with good results.

Partyism and the Church

Rev. William M. Gamble

Part II

The Hypothesis

(1) The insular position of the Church of England, and her hitherto inseparable relation to the whole national life, served to keep intact both ecclesiastical and secular organization in England, all the more so because of the great social and political shiftings of power that were taking place there and on the continent. Even the supremacy of Henry's power, his ability to repudiate the Papacy while

spiritual functions went on uninterruptedly, — served to keep intact and continuous the organized life of Church and nation. Admittedly, the determining force of this isolation and consolidation of Church and nation was the self-will of a wicked king with unprecedented power; but as a providential circumstance it was unique.

(2) Continental Protestantism made the sweeping charge against the whole ecclesiastical system of the Catholic Church, its claims and doctrines as to the means of grace—in fact against the whole Christian tradition in so far as it was a tradition and not an original written document—that it was all of purely human origin, and that as men had made it, men could abolish or change or reconstruct it. Holy Scripture was excepted from this indictment on account of the great deference of the time toward books, and all who knew and could give account or explanation of their meaning. The letter of Scripture (with some reservations of which Luther showed the first signs) was treated with great reverence. But the claims of the Church and her hierarchy to Divine institution was flatly condemned by continental Protestants as an imposture. The priesthood of all believers was asserted as though representative priesthood was nullified by it. And because of the need of organization and discipline, rival systems were set up, claiming to be *de novo* constructions of Christianity, based on a "scriptural" pattern.

(3) The Church of England, isolated yet kept undivided in organization, but enfeebled in popular backing by the ruthless looting of the monasteries, and by the bloody suppression of popular uprisings on behalf of ancient Christianity, came under the hands of students of the "new learning" in which Protestant and Renaissance ideas were dis-

seminated. Cranmer might be called Lutheran in his general tendency of thought, later tending toward Zwinglianism. Later, Bucer, also Lutheran, had much to do with moulding the Church's formularies. Yet the strange fact remains that these men in their efforts to recast Christianity into a Protestant mould, found in the structure and grain of the Church something that resisted their efforts at reconstruction, something that turned the edge of the knife with which they would have cut to the quick of the Church's organic life. Lutheranism bore like wax the stamp of Luther. Calvin and Knox made what they would of their following. But the Church that the Protestants in England tried to make over had received its indelible mark and stamp long before. Since they did not kill it, they could not remould or reconstruct it. They did, however, deeply mark it with the language and thought of the time. The mark that Protestantism made on the Church of England was that from the time of Cranmer the mind of the Anglican Church has had a morbid sensitiveness to assaults made upon principles of authority. It winces at every fresh tirade against dogma, against sacerdotalism, against exclusiveness, against prelacy. The Church of England, or at least the University circles in the Church (for the popular voice had been savagely silenced in blood) listened to the fierce Protestant attacks upon organic Christian tradition with an air almost apologetic. They did not at the time furnish the Church with any clear and systematic reply to these attacks. But of certain parts of the elemental Christian deposit the Church of England was sure, even before Hooker analyzed their rationale: she made sure of the preservation of a sacerdotal ministry, she authorized no other but a liturgical public worship, she attested to the universal

need of the two greatest sacraments, she appealed to the authority of the inspired Scriptures. She revised and condensed into one manual all the most essential of official formulas of prayer. And wherever she changed phrases she was careful, where possible, to conform the language to Scripture phraseology,—not however with a view to reconstruction or reinterpretation of doctrine, sacraments, or order, for she made no effort or claim to reinterpret Christianity or reconstruct the Church. She claimed to give only what she had received. Her profuse use of Scripture phrases was dictated by a spirit quite the reverse from that of the contentious Bible-mongering of the ranter, bent on proving his crotchet. The governing intention of Prayer-Book scripture phrasing is conservative and noncommittal. It is true that almost invariably Anglican formularies show an anxiety to avoid, if possible, severe criticism from the Protestant direction.

The fundamental attitude of the Anglican Church was that of one who is suspending judgment. In the Reformation period and since, she has been the Gamaliel among Catholic Churches, giving Protestantism its chance to prove how far its sweeping arraignment of the whole Christian tradition may be justified.

This is why the Articles do not presume to do over again the work of the great Catholic councils, but after stating certain elementary truths, the Articles refer to certain controverted questions as guardedly as a person in a state of judicial suspense would do if he were to try to show that he understood the force of certain accusations, while reserving his real opinion of their application till the evidence is all in.

Four hundred years have passed, and it is more than doubtful if Protestantism has made out its case against

Catholic tradition. It is not doubtful at all that it has failed lamentably as a reconstruction of Christianity and an improvement on Catholicism. Still, from the Anglican point of view, not sufficient evidence is in to convince all judicious Anglicans. Enough evidence there was to convince the Caroline divines that Puritanism and continental Protestantism contained seeds of destruction from which the Church must be vigilantly guarded. The nineteenth century Tractarians saw signs of the beginning of the social demoralization that is today's menace, and traced it to the incipient anarchy of the supremacy of private judgment. And we, today, see Protestantism seeking to transform itself into a federation ruled by a hierarchy of secretaries, the purpose of which federation is to preserve the denominational organizations in a coordinated system, and to justify their existence by various forms of service to general human welfare. And so Protestantism has prolonged its existence by changing its form, character, and purpose, with each succeeding century.

Official Anglican neutrality, which we so often and sardonically lament, may not be, then, sheer spineless compromise, or indeterminateness, but it may be the reserve of judicial suspense, which is bound, when all the evidence is in, to pronounce a most weighty and illuminating decision, clarifying the minds of all Christendom.

Because official Anglicanism is slow in committing itself, there is no reason why individual Anglicans should be slow in admitting conviction and testifying to it. But neither are convinced Catholics in the Church warranted in being impatient or nonplussed because so many Churchmen are uncritical and unreflecting Protestants, and show little or nothing of Catholic consciousness. Convinced Catholics

are bound, in this connection (a) to witness unmistakably, but not harshly or ungraciously to their conviction, so as to afford a calm and unflickering light to those who are feeling their way; and (b) they should be very careful not to confuse, repel, or scandalize, by impatience, contempt, or other lack of sympathy or understanding.

But really there is a providential obligation upon every Anglican, whether he calls himself "low," "high" or "broad," to be thoughtful about the spiritual data that lies closest to his hand, and to gather material for decisions as to what is, and what is not, organically Christian. There are many Episcopalians who are almost incredibly unthoughtful, and they are the readiest victims to the spiritual blight of partyism in the Church. There need be no danger of an unsettled frame of mind in the thought of the transitional character of the Anglican truce.

The conclusion to which this hypothesis leads is that the Catholic can see a providential overruling in the partyism which seems inevitable in our part of the Church in this era; he can see this without for a minute indulging a fatuous pride in our vaunted "comprehensiveness." And the Catholic in the Anglican Church need not revolt hopelessly at being tolerated by the more fair-minded type of "broads" as one of a mere school. He can tolerate the liberal and the "low," in his turn, not because they "may be equally right," but because they all have a peculiar, providential opportunity to get at the whole truth of the Christian religion, to get a point of vantage from which to obtain facts at close range, upon which to form judgments on the spiritual issues of the day. Furthermore, a Catholic is anxious, too, by sheer contact and the use and love of the same book, to

open the eyes of others to all the Catholic implications of that book, as well as its explicit Catholicism.

And thus it might be made clear to a child or to a convert that in different ages the Church, and different parts of the Church, have had to labor under various forms of handicap or perplexity; and that the special lot of the Anglo-Catholic is to dwell in Mesech and have his habitation among the tents of Kedar.

The Church teaches that our Lord is on His altar-throne, and yet you were in a church yesterday where nobody seemed to adore, and where all your hosts received, after breakfast. Even so, such things are, and other far worse things have been in the Church of Christ, and standing where they ought not. If those good people have not learned of fasting communion, and if the Presence is as yet rather vague to them, perhaps it is because their priest is teaching them just as much of the faith as they are ready to assimilate under the conditions. "Father, I heard the strangest, the most disquieting, irreverent things in a sermon." Yes, that certainly was bad enough, but it is a vast improvement on the kind of things the good doctor used to say. Some might wonder why he does not go to the Unitarians, but I happen to know that he is learning the Christian religion very gradually; and he is not hurting his parish very much either, for they practically know nothing about religion at all, and he is really teaching them all they are likely to learn. And again, here is a priest who has tried to wake in his people a hunger for the full sacramental life of penance and frequent communion, and there is no response. He feels that his teaching is merely regarded as having a certain æsthetic quality, contributing a kind of mediæval aroma to the services. He forgets that as he him-

self is leading the sacramental life, an unconscious work is going on in the depths, the fruit of which may be long appearing.

"For the divisions of Reuben there are great searchings of heart." And the results of the heart-searchings may be well worth the divisions. The Anglican truce may be easy to ridicule and hard to explain, from a Catholic point of view. Doubts are on that account expressed as to the genuineness of our claim to be Catholic. But in view of the Catholic conviction that exists among us, and the solemnity of the obligations to the Church sealed in her sacraments, the extreme doubtfulness of the morality of an escape from the Anglican situation requires a vast deal of certitude to justify it.

Some Aspects of Reservation

Rev. Edwin D. Weed.

IT has been well pointed out that reservation is a necessary part of the mass, whenever the number of communicants is large. If all can gather around the altar at once, reservation is not appreciable. But if the sacrament is administered to several railsful of people in succession there is necessarily reservation from one railful to another.

Sometimes, after all are communicated at the rail, there may be a lame or paralyzed person in a pew. The priest will then carry the sacrament from the chancel and administer to the person in the pew, or even possibly to a sick person reclining on a lounge in the vestry. The mass may be said in a hospital chapel, and the priest may carry the sacra-

ment down long corridors, in order to communicate a sick person in a distant ward.

In such cases as these we have reservation, and also carrying about during the celebration of the mass. The reservation may last for half or three-quarters of an hour, and the carrying about may take some minutes. We remember that reservation and carrying about are joined in a certain Article of Religion.

After the mass is ended on a Sunday morning, many priests are called upon to carry the sacrament to a sick person in the next house, in the next street, in a crowded tenement, in the country. In crowded tenements, and in the case of bed-ridden people who wish to make their regular Sunday communion, this is practically the only way in which the sacrament can be administered at all. And who can give any reason why the sick person should not regularly receive the Lord's Body on the Lord's own day, and even more so than well people? The reservation involved in this administration after mass may last an hour, even two; and the carrying about may be for a mile, or five, or ten.

Again, in many churches the sacrament is reserved on Sunday for a person who may be sick on Monday, on Tuesday, on Wednesday, throughout the week. I should like to know who would dare to send a sick person to his Maker unhouselled; who would dare to send a dying man in to the portals of the grave without giving him for his comfort and help the Lord of living and dead, who is the resurrection and the life,—who has the keys of hell and of death. Truly the death agonies must be terrible of any one who would so dare to send a dying man out of this world, of any one who would dare forbid the sacrament to be carried at once, in haste, to any man in his hour of need!

And so the sacrament is reserved. It is reserved in mass to communicate people who come forward, one after another. It is reserved after mass to communicate those who have sent notice that they wish to be communicated that day, but cannot come to church. It is reserved after mass to be ready to help any one at once, in haste, in his hour of desperate need.

But it is all the same reservation. Whether the sacrament is for half an hour, or half a day, or half a week, it is all the same. It is all reservation. So also carrying about is the same carrying about. Whether the sacrament is carried from the altar to the rail, from the altar to the pew, to the vestry, to the next house, the next street, the next town, —it is all the same. It is all carrying about. It is really therefore idle talk whether reserving and carrying about the sacrament are lawful or unlawful. Mass cannot be said and communion administered unless the sacrament is both reserved and *carried about.* So far from being forbidden by our rite, reservation is an absolutely necessary part of it.

The Purpose of the Incarnation and the Sacrament.

It has been well said that the primary purpose of the Incarnation was the salvation of the world. "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." But when God was manifest in the flesh, men took advantage of the opportunity to worship Him in the flesh. "When Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus' knees."

So too the primary purpose of the Blessed Sacrament is the salvation of the world. "The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." But when we have our Lord present under the veils of bread and wine,

we take advantage of the opportunity to worship Him under the veils of bread and wine. So it was prophesied; and so it has come to pass. The Church commands us to kneel in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament. This is an act of worship toward our Lord then present. It is also specified that the kneeling is to be devout, additionally showing that worship is intended.

Reservation after Communion

Aside and distinct from the reservation involved in communion, the Anglican Church, as one of our bishops has well pointed out, orders reservation without any purpose of communion.

In the Roman Church, when all have communicated, the priest consumes what is left of the sacred host, and the end of the mass is said with the altar bare.

Our Church, however, does not at all allow the sacrament to be consumed at this time. When all have communicated, the priest is directed to place what remains of the Blessed Sacrament on the altar, and to cover it with a white linen veil. In theological language the sacrament so put openly on the altar is said to be "exposed." The sacrament is then kept on the altar until after the end of the mass. Our Church, therefore, after the communion, commands both the reservation and also the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament.

Let us be perfectly clear that this reservation is not for purpose of communion. Reservation for future communion is commonly made before those in the church are communicated. The priest, having communicated himself, opens the tabernacle and places in it as much of the sacrament as he thinks he will need during the week. The tab-

ernacle is then shut, and this portion of the sacrament is, for the remainder of the mass, officially out of consideration. He then communicates the people. He then places what is left openly on the altar. After the blessing he, and others if necessary, consume this. The Church is very explicit that this reservation is not made for communion. "When all have communicated," p. 237, rubric 3; "The communion ended," p. 513, rubric 3; "The communion being done," p. 522, rubric 4.

As this reservation is not made for purposes of communion, it is evidently made for purposes of worship. That this is so the Church shows by what she then proceeds to do. In the presence of the reserved (and exposed) sacrament, the Church now directs us to sing (or say) the Our Father; to make our Thanksgiving; to sing the *Gloria in Excelsis;* and sometimes to perform other acts of devotion.

As our Church differs from the rest of the Catholic Church in reserving the sacrament openly on the altar after the communion, so she differs from the rest of the Catholic Church in performing these devotions at this point. It is very evident that she,—or the Holy Ghost speaking through her, which is the same thing,—desires to give especial honor to the Blessed Sacrament. The Holy Ghost saw that evil days were coming when men's hearts would wax cold, and He saw that the Anglican Church, especially, would have to fight the battle with unbelief; and therefore He took pains that the Anglican Church, especially, of all Catholic communions, should reserve the Sacrament for the purpose of worship.

No other Church performs these devotions at this point. The solemn recitation of the Our Father is a recognized and central feature of every known liturgy, including ours.

But in all other liturgies it is said at the end of the prayer of consecration, just before the communion. We alone sing it in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament reserved specifically for that purpose.

So too the *Gloria in Excelsis* is a recognized and important part of at least all western liturgies. But in all other western liturgies it is sung at the opening of the mass, before the collect, epistle and gospel. We alone sing it in the presence of the reserved and exposed sacrament.

Furthermore, the *Gloria in Excelsis* sung in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament is an act of worship of the most direct kind. In that hymn we directly address our Lord: "O Lord, the only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ . . . That takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us." Inasmuch as our Lord is present under the veils of bread and wine, and inasmuch as we address and worship our Lord, we necessarily worship our Lord where He is present, — i. e., in the sacrament, under the bread and wine. Or, as theologians put the matter in a brief way for convenience, we worship the sacrament: meaning thereby, that we worship our Lord in the sacrament.

To say, if anyone does, that, our Lord being present, we do not worship our Lord there, but somewhere else, is a theological subtlety beyond the simple mind of the present writer. Indeed this writer does not see how such a thing could be done.

The Anglican Church therefore commands the sacrament to be reserved and exposed on the altar at a time when in other churches it has already been consumed. The Anglican Church has transferred the Our Father and the *Gloria in Excelsis* from the places which they elsewhere hold in the celebration of the mass, and orders them to be

sung in the presence of the sacrament so reserved and exposed. The Anglican Church therefore reserves the sacrament for the purpose of worship.

The Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament

Worship, however, does not exhaust the purposes for which the Anglican Church orders the sacrament to be reserved. The proper devotions being ended, the priest is then directed to give in its presence, the Peace and the Blessing. The Peace and the Blessing have occupied different places in different rites. In the Eastern liturgies they commonly come early in the mass, before or after the Creed. In Western liturgies they commonly come after the Our Father. The Anglican Church, in the sixteenth century transferred them to the place they now occupy and orders them to be given in the presence of the sacrament, reserved and exposed.

Now to give the Blessing in the presence of the exposed sacrament is a peculiarly sacred act, because He from whom all blessing flows is there upon the altar. In all ministrations, we must remember, the priest can claim to be no more than a mouthpiece, he can utter the words only; it is Christ alone who gives the essential validity of every act. "Whatsoever he shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," is the principle that runs through all priestly ministration. When, therefore, the blessing is given in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament, the blessing necessarily comes from the sacrament. The priest says the outward words only, the Lord Himself blesses, who is veiled under the bread and wine.

The Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, therefore, as well as the Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, are necessary parts of our rite.

Now, so far, there is no trouble. All churchmen, Protestants, Low Churchmen, and others, are perfectly willing to reserve the sacrament when it is not needed for communion, to worship it, and to bless in its presence, during the mass. Catholics, however, having been taught to use these devotions during mass, like to use them at other times also; and here there has been trouble; although just why it is really difficult to understand.

Devotion after Mass

Whether what we are commanded to do at mass may not also profitably be done at other times too, is not, it would seem to the writer, a question that ought to divide brethren very much. Mind, I say profitable now; not lawful. I shall have something to say about lawfulness presently.

But, frankly, I do not like the word "lawful" in this connection. It savors too much of that legal system that is tied to the name of Moses. It does not savor of the Gospel. St. Paul is at great pains to tell us, in the letter to the Romans and elsewhere, that Christian men ought to forget about the law. Not that we are to break the law. God forbid! But when we are really inwardly united to Christ we shall so enjoy doing the right things that we shall do them without ever thinking of the law, and so keep the law without ever thinking of it.

And so the right question in regard to this matter is—is it profitable? Is it profitable for the faithful to gather together from time to time and worship the Blessed Sacrament, and receive the Blessing from the Blessed Sacrament, just as they do Sunday by Sunday at mass? I believe it will be hard for anyone to show that it is not profitable. Catholics believe that it is profitable.

Lawfulness of Devotions after Mass

Still someone will ask—Is it lawful? We must always be ready to give an answer to everyone. Let us then for a moment give heed to the men of law.

The question is—granted certain devotions are practical, nay rather, are commanded in, or during mass: is it lawful to use the same or similar devotions out of, or apart from mass? Now no one really has any doubt on this point at all. If a thing is commanded for use at mass it does not follow that it is forbidden at any other time. No one has ever said that; it is not so sacrosanct that whatever it touches is thereby forbidden at any other time. Reading the Scriptures is commanded at mass; no one therefore shuts up the Scriptures until mass is said again. Preaching is commanded at mass, but no one supposes that that seals the lips of preachers at every other time. The Our Father, the collection of the alms of the faithful, the Creed, prayer itself, are all a part of mass; do they then all stop when mass is ended? So, not otherwise, adoration and the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament are commanded at mass; does that stop them and taboo them at any other time?

The right of the matter is just the other way. To use a thing at mass endorses it. When the Church commands a devotion for use at mass she thereby gives that particular devotion the very strongest endorsement that can be given. When we gather at other times, and at many times, for prayer and devotion, in addition to the regular offices of the Church, the very best devotion that we can find, and the devotions that are the most laudable for us to use, are those devotions that we have already used at mass. If our Lord hears any devotions, we may be sure that He hears these especially with a loving and merciful ear.

Additional Legal Considerations

We ought really to stop now, because the question is entirely settled, and there is nothing more to be said. But there are certain points that the men of law are fond of, and I suppose we really shall have to speak of them.

No one, I suppose now, doubts that reservation is lawful after the communion. But some men say it is not lawful after the blessing; and they point to the second rubric on page 240.

I shall not say much on this point. It has been fully discussed by much abler pens than mine. I will say here only two things.

First, if this rubric forbids reservation after the blessing in the Anglican Church, it forbids it in every Catholic communion under heaven. There is nothing Anglican about this rubric; its regulation is a recognized part of Catholic practice, and it is found in every known liturgy. It deals with a practical case that exists everywhere; and that all liturgies solve in the same way. After all needs of communion, present and future, have been provided for, practically always, at every celebration of the mass, some of the consecrated elements remain; like the bread left over after our Lord fed the five thousand. What is to be done with it? All liturgies direct the priest to consume it. If this regulation does not forbid reservation in the Roman or Eastern liturgies, it does not in ours; or turn it the other way around, if you prefer.

Second, that there *will be* future needs of communion, the American Church definitely recognizes when she commands us to pray for "all others who shall be partakers of this holy communion." There will not be any "others" unless some portion of the consecrated elements is reserved for their needs as they arise.

Extra-liturgical Devotions

The question that we are considering is part of a larger question known, technically, as the question of "extra-liturgical devotions." Granted that the prescribed offices of the Church are to be or have been said, are we allowed to pray at any other time; and, if allowed to pray, what devotions shall we use? Or, the offices of the Church being duly said, must we shut our mouths tight, and not dare to open them in prayer at all, until the time for the next office comes round?

Now, as a matter of fact, the writer has never known a Low Church brother to hesitate at this question for one moment. Low Churchmen never hesitate to put an *extempore* prayer or two into any service, whenever they feel moved to do so by the promptings of the Spirit. They never hesitate to get up whole services, and *extempore* prayer meetings, all on their own account, whenever they think they will do good to souls. And yet *extempore* prayer is not officially recognized by the Church. But when Catholics do the same thing, and doing the same thing, use the same devotions that mother Church uses, somehow the case is different. But this writer cannot at all see just what the difference is.

There is however a school, composed of English archbishops mostly, and some others, that does say that when the offices of the Church are ended we must shut our mouths tight until the time for the next office comes round. In the minds of the archbishops the offices of the Church are something like a prayer machine. The Buddhists have a way of writing out prayers on a piece of paper, then they put it into a machine and turn it around on a wheel. It is meritorious to turn the wheel.

Now in the minds of English archbishops the offices of the Church are a fixed and exact form, which must neither be added to nor taken away from. Once in so often (how often not specified) the form must be turned around. And when it has been turned around, all religion must stop, until the time comes to turn it around again.

Some such views as these have been set forth of late years in certain learned "Opinions." When we examine these Opinions we find that they are based on a certain thing known as an "Act of Uniformity." This is the basis of it all. Now, if the base were shattered, the whole structure must fall to the ground.

We must remember that an Act of Uniformity is nothing with which the Church has anything to do. It is a civil ordinance; an enactment of the State. It is of Caesar, and it savors of Caesar (or Henry VIII!). It has no ecclesiastical force. It has nothing to do with the law of Christ. For English archbishops to interpret church laws on the basis of an Act of Uniformity is to fall into exactly the same heresy as the Jewish high priests, who, when the living God stood before them, proclaimed to Pilate, "We have no king but Caesar." In consequence the archbishops' utterances are entitled to exactly the same respect.

True Principle of Extra-liturgical Devotions

The right principle is, that, the prescribed offices of the Church, Lauds, Mass, and Vespers, being said daily, the faithful are at liberty to use in addition, either by insertion and by addition in the offices themselves, or at other times, any devotions that may be for the glory of God and the good of souls. The condition being, that if used with the offices extra devotions should be harmonious to those offices; and

of course all devotions must always be agreeable to the Catholic faith.

Any devotions that are pious and helpful to souls are legitimately used along with the offices of the Church or at other times. But when a devotion forms part of the prescribed offices, to use it at other times also is especially laudable. Thus it is especially laudable, at a special, or extra service, to sing the *Magnificat*, or the *Benedictus*, or the *Nunc Dimittis*, because those hymns already form part of Lauds and Vespers. And so the Adoration and the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament are especially laudable devotions to be used at additional services, because they are already used regularly at the celebration of the mass.

Our Lord's Fear

What our Lord is afraid of in regard to extra-liturgical devotions is that we shall not use them enough. Our Lord is not afraid we shall pray too much. He has not given any long and stern denunciations against too much prayer. We cannot find them anywhere in Holy Writ.

He does say a great deal against people who devour widows' houses, and then stand and pray on the street corners. He does not like these people at all, and He denounces them very severely.

What He is afraid of is that we shall not pray enough. He is afraid that we shall be content to pray only at the prescribed offices of the Church, and will not want to pray at other times also.

He tells us of the Publican, who stood in the temple and said, "God be merciful to me a sinner," which form of words probably formed no part of any special service of the day. This certainly was an unofficial service, if ever there was one.

He tells us of the widow, who was not content to pray only at the usual time, when the judge was holding court, but who prayed at all times. She came at unusual and inconvenient times; and at length she gained her suit.

He tells us of the poor man, who had nothing to eat in his house and to whom a friend came in the middle of the night. He did not wait to go in the usual time, and in the usual way in the morning when his neighbor would be up and about. But he prayed in a very extraordinary way. He went to his neighbor's house in the middle of the night, pounded on the door, and made him get out of bed and give him what he wanted.

How pharisees and matrons and rich men may care to pray, we cannot tell. Being ourselves publicans and widows and poor men, needing all things, we cannot help ourselves. But we must come to the Lord at all times, and in all ways, and beg Him for the grace we need.

We wish to pray; rather we need to pray, in the usual time and at unusual times; in the usual way and in unusual ways. We worship the Blessed Sacrament at the usual time when the Church mercifully exposes it for us on the altar at every mass; we wish to worship it at unusual times also. We thankfully receive the blessing from the Blessed Sacrament in the usual way, when He mercifully bestows it at the end of every sacrifice; but we wish to receive it in unusual ways also, when the sacrament is primarily reserved for other purposes.

We may not please English archbishops, but we do have a feeling that we may please our blessed Lord. When our Lord was on earth mothers gathered around Him with their little children, and wanted Him to bless them. The apostles drove them off. They told the anxious mothers

that the Lord had come for one purpose, and they had no right to approach Him for any other. He came to preach, not to bless children. But the Lord rebuked the apostles, and called the children to Him. We, too, dare to come to our Lord for blessing, even though mighty and learned Fathers of the Church may have forbidden us.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Things Most Surely Believed Among Us. With Appendix, Laying on of Hands. Four Lectures. By Rt. Rev. Philip M. Rhinelander, Bishop of Pennsylvania. Published by the Educational Department of the Diocese of Pennsylvania.

These four lectures present in brief form, in clear terms, and in language adapted to those untrained in technical theology, the divine philosophy that underlies the Religion of the Incarnation. It is not a text book designed for the student, but a summary in popular form for the intelligent layman of the Church, teaching about those fundamental facts of her religion: the Incarnation, the Church, the Sacraments, and the Ministry. The last thing to be expected or desired in theological teaching is originality and in no sense is the substance of this little book original; but the treatment of it is so fresh, the illustrations taken so invariably from everyday life, that it gives the effect of the old truths being stated in new guise. Its value is that it sticks close to the Catholic tradition. The Appendix is particularly useful in calling attention afresh to the Apostolicity of the Anglican teaching about Confirmation, most important for the layman to understand in the light of current controversy and revolutionary proposal. L. G.

A Fighting Church. By the Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, B.D. Milwaukee, Morehouse Publishing Co.; London, A. R. Mowbray & Co.

The underlying thought of this little volume of five essays is that the Church and Christianity are decadent. The first essay, entitled "Christi-

anity an Adventure," is strikingly negative in its tone. It is, however, strong in the fresh and full array of characteristics which the Church has lost or lacks. To remedy these defects the author pleads for loyalty as an adventure such as inspired thousands to enlist for the Great War. The second essay, "Fighting for a Kingdom," carries much of the same idea and urges the Church to regain its honor by throwing itself into the fight and thus retrieving its lost colors.

"The Purpose of Prayer" is strong. It deals fearlessly with the popular conception of praying for what we want, and very lucidly and forcefully shows that the only legitimate prayer is to possess the mind of Christ,—to do His will. "It is the soldier's prayer for strength to carry on." The kernel of the essay which might well be enlarged and extended is, "Christian Prayer . . . . is not bending God's will to ours, but bending our will to God's."

"The Use of the Sacraments" centers about the statement that "we must endeavor to interpret the Sacraments not in terms of receiving, but giving, not in terms of individual welfare, but in terms of individual service." The last essay, "Worship and the Kingdom," is perhaps the best. It looks upon worship as nearly a lost art. Its analysis of the psychology of the modern mind so deeply dyed with Protestantism is very helpful.

A militant note rings throughout the book such as one would hope to find in a *post-bellum* publication under such a title. It is a book full of thought-provoking statements and inspiration. FLOYD S. LEACH.

The Menace of Spiritualism. By Elliott O'Donnell. Frederick A. Stokes Company.

Spiritism in the Light of the Faith. By the Rev. T. J. Hardy, M.A. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

The widespread interest in Spiritualism in England has called forth these two books. Mr. O'Donnell writes from the point of view of an "undenominational Christian." Spiritualism he feels is incompatible with any form of Christianity and he exposes the frauds and dangers of the cult with little respect for the investigations of men like Sir Oliver Lodge. The phenomena of Spiritualism when not plain fraud are the work of demons. The book is a bitter indictment of Spiritualism with its very real menace to mental and moral health written by a man who evidently

has considerable knowledge of its workings. There is a foreword by Father Bernard Vaughan.

Father Hardy writes from the point of view of a Catholic Churchman with the object of showing how much more satisfaction one can find in the teachings of the Church on the state of the departed than in the uncertainties of Spiritualism. In a desire to be fair he deals more gently with the Spiritualists than does Mr. O'Donnell, but he has little patience with Sir A. Conan Doyle's misrepresentations of the teachings of the Church. He agrees with Mr. O'Donnell that Spiritualists come to have a degraded conception of our Lord and end by giving up the practice of religion for which they substitute a mere curiosity for the unseen. In his exposition of the Church's faith Fr. Hardy gives us too much of a theological disquisition for a popular treatment of the subject. The average person would be more likely to read Mr. O'Donnell. Books of this kind are valuable as a warning to those who are inclined to dabble in Spiritualism, but of little use with the confirmed believer in the realities of mediumistic powers. G. R. H.

Private Dowding. With Notes by W. T. P. New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1919.

This book purports to be "A plain record of the after-death experiences of a soldier killed in battle, and some questions on world issues answered by the messenger who taught him wider truths."

To use the words of W. T. P. "One cannot doubt the possibility of spirit communion, ... there can be no final proof concerning these matters. One must be guided by the interior worth of the messages themselves." If this be so, the unsophisticated reader is entitled to question the source and authorship of these messages. In the name of common sense we are becoming somewhat impatient of the kind of stuff which is being handed out to us ostensibly from the spirit world, and cannot agree that the great spiritual movements of the last century were Bahaism in the East and Christian Science in the West.

The Messenger foretells wonderful political and social times ahead for the human race, which very utopian sentiments are recorded exactly as they flowed through the pen of W. T. P. He cannot guess at the identity of the Messenger, and naïvely remarks that "here again imagination may prove responsible. Imagination of a subconscious order is capable of playing strange tricks with the mind." W. H. B.